

55  
THE

# DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1890.

---

## ART. I.—UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

THE question of University Education in Ireland has come once more to the front. Since Mr. Balfour's celebrated declaration in the House of Commons towards the close of last Session, public men of every party have touched upon the question, and the tone of their observations is very significant. Mr. Balfour said that, in his opinion, something ought to be done to give a higher University education to Roman Catholics in Ireland; that it was perfectly clear that nothing which had been hitherto done would really meet the wants and wishes of the Roman Catholic population in Ireland; and that we have nothing but to try and devise some scheme by which the wants of the Roman Catholic population should be met other than those which, up to the present, had been attempted. He was not on that occasion ready to suggest even the outlines of what the scheme ought to be, but that "they ought, if possible, carry out such a scheme as would satisfy all the legitimate aspirations of the Roman Catholics he entertained no doubt."

Nearly all the newspapers and a good many of the politicians at once rushed to the conclusion that Mr. Balfour, in these words, had formally promised to charter and endow a Roman Catholic University in Ireland during the coming year—a project, whether real or imaginary, which was at once denounced from various quarters and from very different motives. It was a deep-laid scheme to sow dissension between English and Irish Radicals; it was an attempt to draw a red-herring across the Home Rule scent, and thereby divert keen-nosed politicians from their pursuit of that *summum bonum*; it was a Greek gift to seduce the Irish hierarchy from their allegiance to the national cause; it was the price to be paid for the Papal condemnation of

VOL. XXIII.—NO. I. [Third Series.]

A

boycotting and the plan of campaign ; it was a concession to certain reactionary Irish Bishops ; it was, in a word, a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. A few ultra-Orangemen in Belfast, Liverpool, and Glasgow also raised their tiny voices in protest against Mr. Balfour's project ; but what is much more surprising, this supposed project was denounced by leading Catholic members of the Home Rule party, because it was a Denominational scheme of education. Mr. T. P. O'Connor said at Peterborough that, for his part, "he should be sorry to see the college of any sect endowed by the Government, and that the Nationalists of Ireland, like himself, did not think any man to be the better or worse for his religion."\* Mr. Michael Davitt likewise, in his letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, expressed himself as opposed to Denominational education as it is usually understood. He had a better scheme of his own, which he has not yet propounded, but which will doubtless appear in due course. Mr. Justin McCarthy, however, does not go so far as this, but in the *Contemporary Review* for September he wishes to press another question on the attention of the English public ; and it is this— "Whether the whole settlement of the question about Irish University Education had not better be left to an Irish National Parliament?" It is not to be wondered at that many of the Irish Catholics, taking note of the views held by prominent Irish Nationalists, like Messrs. Davitt and O'Connor, answer Mr. McCarthy's question in the negative, and think it by all means far safer to settle the question now, if, as Mr. Balfour says, it is at all possible.

We think it a very great misfortune that Irish Catholics should allow their views on the Education Question to be warped by political considerations of any kind. It is essentially a religious question ; it is above and beyond politics ; it ought to be discussed and decided on its own merits, that is, from the standpoint of justice and conscience alone. It is a matter that cannot be sold or bargained for, and that ought not be deferred or subordinated to any temporal question whatsoever. A sound Catholic education is, in the estimation of all true Catholics, a precious pearl beyond price, because it is intimately connected with the salvation of immortal souls. We propose to discuss this question, therefore, on its own intrinsic merits, leaving aside all purely political considerations. Let others discuss it, if they will, on the ground of expediency ; we shall discuss it merely on the ground of what is just and right.

Mr. Balfour admits that in this matter of University Educa-

---

\* *Daily News*, October 5.

tion, Irish Roman Catholics have a want and a grievance. Mr. Gladstone has himself admitted the same in still more emphatic language. Years ago he said the state of things was scandalously bad, and last autumn he declared, when criticizing Mr. Balfour's observations, that in his opinion in this matter the Roman Catholics have not yet got justice in Ireland; that, like the Minister, he desires with all his heart to provide for the higher education of the Roman Catholic population, and that Mr. Balfour's declaration that a grievance exists, which ought to be remedied, "is a truism to which the whole population of the country, Catholic and Protestant, must alike assent." As Lord Hartington put it:

We have the authority of Mr. Gladstone, as well as of Mr. Balfour, that this question of University Education in Ireland has not yet been solved, and that it is not yet insoluble. By the authority of both it is the duty of some one to make another attempt to solve this question, and it does not lie in the mouth of one who, like myself, was a member of Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1873, which attempted to settle this question, to declare now that it is a question insoluble by the British Parliament, and which can only be solved by giving power to an Irish Home Rule Parliament to do that which, at the same time, we declare to be wrong and monstrous of an English Parliament to do.\*

It must be borne in mind, too, that Mr. Parnell, at the urgent request of the Irish hierarchy, pressed upon the Government to take up this question, and do justice by removing the admitted grievances of Irish Roman Catholics, especially in this matter of University Education. When the leaders of all the political parties in the House of Commons admit the grievance, and the duty of promptly redressing it, the Government can, we should think, very well afford to despise the protests of a few ultra-Orangemen on the one hand, and of a few extreme and anti-Catholic Radicals on the other.

Mr. Balfour has more recently taken the public into his confidence, and given us an outline of his intentions in this matter of doing educational justice to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He tells us what would be just and right to do, if he could get everybody to help him in doing it, and if the Irish would cordially accept the generous boon which he has in store for them. If Mr. Balfour were Minister in a Utopian Republic, he might perhaps talk in this fashion, but he ought to know that no Irish Question ever was, or probably ever will be, settled in this pleasant way. He announces clearly enough that he will

---

\* Speech at Aberdeen, October 2. See *The Times*, October 3.

not give us a Catholic University in Ireland with the power of granting degrees and all the other privileges of a university. Neither will he endow any theological chairs with public money, nor any religious sect as such. Even if he were disposed to make any proposals of this kind, it is quite evident that he could never carry them through the Imperial Parliament—it would be simply to rush on destruction.

Even the imaginary proposal supposed to have been made by Mr. Balfour of chartering and endowing a Catholic University seems to have awakened very considerable alarm and opposition in various quarters, and the Minister has found it necessary to declare that he never contemplated anything of the kind. Yet such a solution of the question would undoubtedly be most in accordance with the abstract justice of the case. For if Trinity College, an institution Protestant in its flavour, and complexion, and practical working, as Mr. Balfour admits, has not only all the privileges of a University, but enormous revenues for the benefit of a small section, and that the richer section, of the population, why in the name of justice and common sense should not the Catholic majority be entitled to at least equal rights and privileges in this matter of higher education?

We shall not discuss this question, however, on the principles of abstract justice. We admit the difficulties by which it is surrounded, and we shall consider what is practicable and reasonable even from an English and Scotch point of view, rather than from an Irish point of view. And yet the fact that it is to a Scotch audience that Mr. Balfour unbosoms himself on this question, and that it is *their* assent he asks for, not ours, is a very significant one. We shall take the liberty of putting forward some other considerations that must be taken into account in the settlement of this matter, and we are at least as well entitled to discuss it as any of Mr. Balfour's numerous correspondents.

The past history of this question will serve to throw much light on the problem now awaiting solution. The blunders and failures of the past in dealing with this question have been frankly admitted; yet too often statesmen, misled by the same false principles, fall into similar errors. This was signally the case with Mr Gladstone in 1873. He undertook to remedy the grievances of Catholics, which notoriously arose from the mixed system, that had been forced upon them, and yet his proposal was simply a measure to extend and consolidate that very mixed system, the *fons et origo* of all the mischief. The fundamental mistake which English statesmen have made in this, as in many other questions, is the assumption that they know better what suits Ireland than Irishmen themselves do. This has been

shown in every successive attempt to deal with the Education Question, and especially with Higher or University Education.

On the 31st of July, 1845, the royal assent was given to "An Act to enable Her Majesty to Endow New Colleges for the Advancement of Learning in Ireland." We may acquit the authors of this Bill of any purpose hostile to the Catholic religion; we may even credit them with the sincere purpose of legislating solely for the advancement of learning in Ireland. This is admitted in the Synodical Address of the great Synod of Thurles, which was issued the year after these colleges first came into operation.

The system may have been devised—say the Fathers—in a spirit of generous and impartial policy; but the statesmen who framed it were not acquainted with the inflexible nature of our doctrines, and with the jealousy with which we are obliged to avoid everything opposed to the purity and integrity of our Catholic faith. Hence these institutions, which would have called forth our profound and lasting gratitude, had they been framed in accordance with our religious tenets and principles, must now be considered as an evil of a formidable kind, against which it is our imperative duty to warn you with all the energy of our zeal and all the weight of our authority.

These are weighty words, which any English statesman undertaking to legislate for Ireland would do well to remember, for they point out the true cause of much subsequent agitation and mischief. The Queen's Colleges had been already condemned by the Holy See before they came into operation, on two occasions, in 1847, and again in 1848; that condemnation was now solemnly promulgated by the entire hierarchy of Catholic Ireland; yet the English Government made no real attempt to modify their constitution, or bring them into harmony with the wants and wishes of the Catholic people of Ireland. Once more in their ignorance of Ireland, they miscalculated. They were hoping that by the money prizes, and by the great educational advantages which were offered in the new colleges to a people who always loved learning, they might be tempted to disobey their pastors, and perhaps be gradually weaned away from that affectionate allegiance to their priesthood, which English statesmen have never liked. With this view, £1500 per annum was set apart in each of the colleges for exhibitions and other money prizes, so that there were almost as many exhibitions and scholarships as students in Galway and Cork—exhibitions mostly at that time of sufficient value to support, and clothe, and lodge, and procure books for the poor students, whose parents and families were just emerging from the black shadow of a desolating famine—yet the bait was spurned by those very middle classes for whom the colleges were especially instituted.

During the twenty-two years that elapsed, from 1849 to 1871, the statistics of which I have now before me, the average number of Catholics who matriculated in Belfast was three, in Cork twenty-seven, in Galway forty-three—a number not half that which would have entered one of these colleges if they were so modified in constitution as to admit within their walls those conscientious Catholics who thought an exhibition too dear to be purchased with peril to their faith. Yet these colleges were maintained during all these years, and are still maintained, at enormous expense to the public purse, whilst the Catholic youth of the middle classes frequent the unendowed Catholic colleges that are to be found in every county in Ireland, and several of which, like Clongowes and Blackrock, have more students in Arts than Cork and Galway put together.

In 1866 the first attempt was made to provide a remedy for this state of things, which was at once a grievance and a scandal—a grievance to Catholics, and a scandal in a nation professing the civil and religious equality of all its subjects before the law. In the previous November, several leading statesmen, including Mr. Gladstone, had an interview with the four Catholic Archbishops of Ireland. The Archbishops communicated the substance of the interview to their brother prelates in Ireland, and the result was that, on the 14th of January, 1866, a meeting of the Bishops was held in Dublin, at which a statement was adopted and forwarded to Sir George Grey, the Home Secretary. In this document the Bishops ask her Majesty's Government to grant them "not all that we have a claim to, but to introduce modifications in the existing system of Academical education which will enable Catholic students to obtain University degrees without the sacrifice of principle or conscience of which we complain. We shall be thankful for such changes if they do not interfere with Catholic teaching, and if they tend to put us on a footing of equality with our fellow-subjects of other religious denominations . . . ." This was certainly a modest and reasonable demand—liberty of conscience and liberty of teaching, with the right to obtain University degrees, and, of course, some endowment, which might tend in this respect also to put Catholics on a footing of equality with their fellow-subjects of other religious denominations. Then the prelates point out how this may be effected in detail :

1st. That the University founded by the Roman Catholic Bishops (in Dublin) will be chartered as a College within the new University (which the Government proposed to establish) in such a manner as to leave the department of teaching Catholics altogether in the hands of Catholics, and under the control of the Bishops, its founders.

2ndly. That in order to place this new Catholic College on a footing

of equality with other institutions, a suitable endowment be given to it; since it will be frequented by the great mass of Catholics, as it would be manifestly unfair to oblige them to tax themselves for the support of their own College, while institutions, which they, on conscientious grounds, condemn and shun, are supported out of the public funds, to which they contribute equally with others.

3rdly. That, for the same reason, burses and scholarships be provided either by the application of existing, or the creation of new endowments, so as to place the reward of merit equally within the reach of all.

4thly. That the Catholic University College be empowered to affiliate colleges and schools to itself.

5thly. That the tests of knowledge be applied in such a manner as to avoid the appearance of connecting, even by the identity of name, those who avail themselves of them, or co-operate in applying them with a system which their religion condemns.

6thly. That the tests of knowledge be guarded against every danger of abuse, or of the exercise of any influence hostile or prejudicial to the religious principles of Catholics; that they may be made as general as may be, consistently with a due regard for the interests of education, the time, the manner, and matter of examinations being prescribed, but not the books or special authors, at least in mental and social science, in history, or in cognate subjects; and that, in a word, there be banished from them even the suspicion of interference with the religious principles of Catholics.

7thly. That the Queen's Colleges be re-arranged on the principles of the denominational system of education.

We have quoted the salient points of this document at full length; because it is an authoritative exposition of the views of the Bishops, and enters more into detail than any other document emanating from the same source that has come to our knowledge. As such it is worthy of careful perusal by every one who will have any influence in the settlement of this great question. The general principle laid down is perfectly clear. First, the prelates want a system by which Catholic students can obtain University degrees without sacrifice of principle or conscience; secondly, they want their students, in the effort to obtain these degrees, to be placed on a footing of equality with their fellow-subjects of other religious persuasions. No right-minded man can object to these two demands—to refuse either of them is simply to re-impose civil disabilities on account of religion. The Bishops then suggest a way of carrying out these two principles in practice. The answer of Sir George Grey is even more significant than the petition of the prelates, because it exhibits those points of disagreement between the Catholic demand and the Liberal programme, which it is essential to bear in mind in any future settlement of the question.

Sir George first re-iterates what was long ago admitted, that the founders of the Queen's Colleges meant well; and he adds that her Majesty's Government are still of opinion that the principle on which they were founded is a sound one—a somewhat superfluous if not impertinent observation in the circumstances of the case. But it has this important consequence—that her Majesty's Government declare that they have no intention of proposing any alteration in the principle on which these Colleges are conducted—in other words, in the mixed system of University Education. This was a point-blank refusal to No. 7 of the Episcopal demands—namely, that the Queen's Colleges should be modified or re-arranged on the Denominational system of education. It is, however, mainly a question of squandering public money. If Catholics are placed on that footing of equality to which they are entitled, it is really a very secondary matter how money is spent on the empty halls of Cork and Galway. But it shows how the Liberal Government thought they understood the wants and wishes of Catholic Ireland at the time so much better than Catholic Irishmen themselves. The Government, however, admits that a large number of Irishmen entertain conscientious objections both to the Queen's Colleges and to Trinity College, and consequently have no means of obtaining a degree in Ireland if they aspire to a liberal profession. This they admit is a grievance, and with a view of providing a remedy Sir George Grey simply proposes to assimilate the Queen's University to the London University, and thereby enable it to confer degrees on all comers who pass the examination. This was not much of a boon, for the London University gave its degrees even to Irishmen in exactly the same way; and even at a later date sent over its examiners to certain centres in Ireland, where a considerable number of students was to be found. The Government were, however, willing to grant a "Charter of Incorporation" to the institution founded in Dublin by the Roman Catholic Archbishops, but not in the form of the Draft Charter which the Prelates had sent over with their memorial. They would grant no endowment, at least beyond the expenses for examinations; and they would not give power to affiliate other colleges or schools to the Central College. This was, as they alleged, the exclusive prerogative of an University. As to the two paragraphs about the tests of knowledge and their application, they did not, they said, clearly understand their drift, but the Senate of the new University would be constituted in such a way as to entitle it to the confidence of the various religious bodies, and all the details of the examinations had better be left to this Senate.

The Bishops, in reply to Sir George Grey, very naturally asserted that there was no effective step taken in this scheme to place Catholics on a footing of equality with their non-

Catholic fellow-subjects, but they reserved their definite reply until they should have an opportunity of seeing the two new Charters—that is, of the new University and of the Catholic College. The latter never appeared, and the former which is known to history as the Supplemental Charter, was an abortion, and only survived a brief period. It was issued in June, 1866, and authorized persons other than students of Queen's Colleges to be admitted to examinations, honours, and degrees ; but it appears that it was an illegal document, and the Master of the Rolls, on the application of three graduates of the Queen's University, granted an injunction forbidding the Senate to make any further use of that precious document, and so the Supplemental Charter disappeared from Irish University life ; and, we believe, no one regretted its premature extinction.

It will be seen from the history of these transactions what ideas the *doctrinaires* of the Liberal Government in 1866 had about placing Catholics on a footing of educational equality with their fellow-subjects ; and how much better they knew what was good for us in Ireland than we possibly could know ourselves.

Even the poor boon of allowing certain Catholic Colleges to be affiliated to the Incorporated College in Dublin they curtly refused on grounds that, as a matter of fact, are not true, and even, if true, would furnish no adequate reason for their refusal. Liberty and equality—certainly we will give you both and degrees too ! but of money—and all that money can procure, buildings, professors, books, museums, exhibitions and rewards—not a shilling. These are not for conscientious Papists, if you won't come to our Colleges in spite of your Bishops and your consciences, you must do without those things—such aids to learning are not for you. And an enlightened press applauded loudly, and proclaimed, at the corners of all the streets, how fairly and how justly English statesmen governed Ireland !

Mr. Fawcett's Act was the next move. The Catholic claim was indefeasible. The Liberals felt it ; and although they were not prepared to do anything in reality, nevertheless, they wished to appear to do something. That would answer just as well, and what is more, save their consistency. Trinity College was a Protestant institution, as it is to this day, and will be for many generations to come. It had 200,000 acres of the soil of Ireland ; splendid buildings erected at the public expense ; a large number of rich livings in its gift to reward its faithful servitors, but all secured to members of the Established Church ; whilst the poor Papists in Stephen's Green would not get from the public funds what would glaze a broken pane of glass. It was clear that this state

of things could never last; so the Liberals took heart of grace, and resolved to throw open, *on paper*, everything in Trinity to Roman Catholics, as well as to Protestants; knowing well that Trinity would continue to be quite as great a stronghold of Protestantism after the Act as it was before it, and perhaps a trifle more so. We do not say that Mr. Fawcett knew all this, but the Trinity men knew it well. Outwardly, they gave a reluctant consent; but they were glad in their hearts, for was it not in their own hands to hold what they had got, whilst the passing of the Bill would save them from the Philistines? Conscientious Churchmen, however, were strongly opposed to Mr. Fawcett's Bill. They declared that Trinity College was founded by a great Protestant Queen, that it was endowed with Protestant funds, that it was the mainstay of the Protestant Church in Ireland, and they strongly objected to its secularization, as they justly called it. The Roman Catholics, too, loudly declared that opening Trinity College would not satisfy them; they did not ask it; and they would not have it. The project would only add one more to the existing Queen's Colleges. These views were tersely summed up by an observation of the present Lord Emly, then Mr. Monsell, in the House of Commons. "The scheme," he said, "would deprive Trinity College of the confidence of the Protestants, and would not gain for it the confidence of the Catholics."

In July, 1867, Mr. Fawcett's motion for throwing open Trinity College was lost only by the casting vote of the Speaker. The Conservative Government, then in power, saw clearly that they must at once either do justice to the Catholics by conceding their demands, or adopt Mr. Fawcett's Bill to save themselves and Trinity College from an adverse vote of the House of Commons.

The Earl of Mayo now appears upon the scene, and announced the Government proposals in the House of Commons on the 10th of March, 1868, and a few days afterwards sent a memorandum to the Archbishop of Cashel, in which he proposes for the first time to create a Catholic University, "which, as far as circumstances would permit, should stand in the same position to Roman Catholics as Trinity College does to Protestants: that is to say, that the governing body should consist of, and the teaching should be conducted mainly by, Roman Catholics, but that full security should be taken that no religious influence should be brought to bear on students who belonged to another faith." This was hopeful so far; but in carrying out these general principles Lord Mayo made some fatal mistakes.

The proposal now made is as follows:—

That a Charter for a Roman Catholic University should be granted

to the following persons to be named in the Charter :—A chancellor, a vice-chancellor, four prelates, the President of Maynooth, six laymen, the heads of the colleges proposed to be affiliated, and five members to be elected, one by each of the five faculties in the affiliated college or colleges.

The future Senate should be formed as follows :—A chancellor, to be elected by Convocation ; a vice-chancellor, to be appointed by the chancellor ; four prelates, to be nominated by the Roman Catholic hierarchy ; the President of Maynooth ; six laymen, to be elected by Convocation : the heads of the affiliated colleges ; five members, to be elected by the faculties, as before mentioned. The Senate would be twenty in number, all being members of the Roman Catholic Church. Convocation to consist of the Chancellor, Senate, Professors, and Graduates.

Until the colleges are firmly established it may be proper to postpone the question of endowment. It is one of great difficulty, and need not form an indispensable portion of the plan.

It may, however, be necessary to ask Parliament to provide a sufficient sum for the payment of the expenses of the examinations, for the foundation of a certain number of University Scholarships, and the giving away of prizes, and also the payment of the salaries of certain officers and servants of the University, and perhaps some provision for a University hall and examination rooms.

Dr. Leahy of Cashel, and Dr. Derry of Clonfert, were deputed to confer with the Ministers on this project, and in their observations, which they committed to writing, they raise two main objections, and offer two suggestions, that deserve to be carefully noted. They object to the Senate having a veto on the appointment of the heads and professors of the affiliated colleges, but that was a point which very likely the Government would not press ; and, secondly, they object to the Chancellor and the six lay members of the Senate being chosen by Convocation, and not by the Senate itself. It does not appear to be a matter of vital importance, at least so far as the election of the six laymen is concerned.

The suggestions made are of much greater importance. It was suggested :

First—That the Chancellor should be always a Bishop, and that the first Chancellor should be Cardinal Cullen.

Secondly—That as faith and morality may be injuriously affected either by the heterodox teaching of professors, lecturers, and other officers, or by their bad moral example, or by the introduction of bad books into the University programme, the very least power that could be claimed for the Bishops on the Senate, with a view to the counteraction of such evils, would be that of an absolute negative on such books, and on the first nomination of professors, &c. &c., as well as on their continuing to hold their offices after having been judged by the

Bishops on the Senate to have grievously offended against faith or morals.

Here is the rock on which the whole project was wrecked. Except the power indicated in this paragraph were *in some way* secured to the Bishops it could not be called a Catholic University at all, and the Bishops could not, without foregoing a right essentially inherent in their office, take any part in its government as a Catholic institution. Any other point they might concede—but this point they could not concede without at the same time foregoing the exercise of a divine right which belongs to them, and to them alone, as pastors of their flocks. The two prelates put it as clearly and curtly as possible. “According to the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church it is not competent for laymen, nor even for clergymen of the second order, however learned, to judge authoritatively of faith and morality. That is the exclusive province of the Bishops.” Yet the Government replied to this clear *non possumus* of the Bishops with an equally emphatic *non volumus* :—

“The proposition that the episcopal members of the Senate should possess any power greater than their lay colleagues is one that her Majesty’s Government cannot entertain.” And so Lord Mayo’s famous proposal to create a Catholic University came to grief.

Later on, Mr. Fawcett took advantage of Lord Mayo’s failure to pass his own Bill for throwing open the offices, honours, and emoluments of Trinity College to all persons without religious distinction ; but, as was so clearly anticipated, the Catholic grievance was not thereby removed. At a meeting of the Irish Bishops, held in Maynooth on the 18th of August 1869, it was unanimously resolved in the case of the establishment of one National University in this kingdom for examining candidates and conferring degrees, that the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such a University or annexed to it—

(a) They shall have a distinct college conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other colleges of whatsoever denomination or character.

(b) That the University honours and emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects.

(c) That the examinations and other details of University arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics, and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented upon the Senate or other Supreme University body by persons enjoying the confidence of the Catholic bishops, priests, and people of Ireland.

The Bishops furthermore declare that "a settlement of the University Question to be complete, and at the same time in accordance with the wishes of the Catholic people of Ireland, must include the re-arrangement of the Queen's Colleges on the Denominational principle."

Since the failure of Lord Mayo's attempt to create a Catholic University it was felt that the prospects of obtaining a distinct University for Irish Catholics were now considerably diminished. But the Liberals were again in power, and hopes were held out of creating one great National University, in which full justice would be done to Catholics both as to degrees and endowments. Mr. Gladstone, too, had just succeeded in Disestablishing the Protestant Church ; and it was hoped that he would also disestablish Trinity College, and either level up or down in the matter of endowment by dividing its revenues with the Catholic College, or endowing the latter on an equally liberal scale. It is hardly necessary for us to explain at any length how these sanguine hopes were doomed to disappointment. The Minister persisting in his own views with wilful blindness succeeded in producing a scheme which, though ushered in with a great flourish of trumpets, pleased nobody and wrecked his own Government. To fail in an honest effort to do justice, where it had been long denied, would be to fall with honour ; but Mr. Gladstone's project and Ministry both fell amidst a universal shout of disapproval. His persistence in that unhappy scheme in the face of the repeated declarations of the Irish Catholic bishops and priests and people seems to have been nothing short of infatuation. It was confidently hoped that he would charter and endow a Catholic College in the great National University, which he proposed to found, and which would secure the double advantage of the highest standard of education with the widest range of competition, and yet leave freedom and autonomy to the Catholic institution to enable it to follow its own principles. The language in which the Prime Minister at first announced his project was eminently calculated to foster this hope. He admitted that, as regards Catholics, the provision for University Education was "miserably" and "scandalously" bad ; he proposed to redress this grievance ; yet, as the Irish prelates solemnly declared whilst the Bill was yet before the House, "he brought forward a measure singularly inconsistent with his professions, because, instead of redressing, it perpetuates that grievance, upholding two out of three of the Queen's Colleges, and planting in the Metropolis two other great teaching institutions, the same in principle with the Queen's Colleges." And in the matter of endowments, the Catholics as such got nothing at all. Trinity College was left its £50,000 a

year, with all its splendid buildings, and libraries, and museums ; the new University was to get £50,000 more for its own purposes ; Belfast and Cork were each to have about £10,000 a year, but for the Catholic College in Stephen's Green, not a shilling. The Bishops declared they would not affiliate their College to this new University, "unless the proposed scheme be largely modified;" and they had the same objection to the affiliation of any other Catholic colleges in Ireland. This declaration sealed the fate of the Bill. Attacked by the Secularists on one flank, by the Catholic prelates on the other, and by the Conservative Opposition in the front—even though Mr. Cardwell declared that nothing in the Bill was essential—it was found impossible to modify it so as to please the assailants. It came down, and brought the Government with it. The division was taken for the second reading on the 11th of March 1873, and the Ministry resigned on the 13th of March.

The debate on the second reading is full of interest and instruction. The champions of the contending interests put forth all their strength. It was a war of giants, for which the rival orators had long been preparing, for this Irish University measure had been set forth in the Queen's Speech as the principal measure of the Session. Major O'Reilly's speech was remarkable for the frankness and fulness of detail with which he spoke on behalf of the Irish Catholics, as well as the vigour with which he attacked the Queen's Colleges. He declared that he would not send his sons to any college which did not teach his own religion. He could not expose them to the risk of having their cherished faith assailed in lectures on history and philosophy. He would have them taught in a thoroughly Catholic atmosphere, and by a Catholic professor ; whereas Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges were institutions essentially Protestant. All the same, as a citizen and a tax-payer, he demanded educational equality for the institution in which he and Catholics like him meant to educate their sons—that is, State recognition, and a proportionate share of the honours and emoluments granted by the State in aid of University Education. About the same time, Mr. John George McCarthy, the present Land Commissioner, in a letter to the *Spectator*, pertinently asked and answered the question :—“ Why don't I send my sons to 'mixed' colleges ? For the same reason that my fathers did not send their sons to the Protestant Churches, because of conscientious objections. Our fathers endured disabilities for their religious opinions in one case, our sons will endure disabilities for their religious opinions in the other case. But the first infliction is now called persecution ; the second is called equality.” It would be impossible to put the Catholic case in briefer and more cogent form.

On the other hand, all the friends of a liberal education were indignant at the Ministerial proposal to exclude philosophy and modern history from the curriculum of University studies. This was designed as a sop to propitiate the Catholics, but the Catholics repudiated the illiberal boon. It was bad enough to have a mixed University, but a University without philosophy and history was a misnomer—it was neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring ; it was attacked from all quarters, stoned to death by all the people, and no attempt has been even made to resuscitate it. The Royal University in this respect occupies a much more honourable position. Philosophy and modern history hold a high place in its programme, as well the proofs for the immortality of the soul, the existence of God, and the other great truths of Natural Religion.

For the next seven years nothing further was done or attempted. The Liberals had tried their hands twice and failed ; the Conservatives had tried in 1868 and failed also—a failure which, for our own part, we always regretted, because with a little compromise on both sides we think the measure might have been made a good one, and more in accordance with Catholic principles than anything we have since got. Notwithstanding this first failure they resolved, after a considerable interval, to make another effort to remedy the Catholic grievance, and this time they were partially successful, at least to the extent of producing the Royal University.

This latest "Act to Promote the Advancement of Learning, and to extend the benefits connected with University Education in Ireland" received the Royal Assent on the 15th of August 1879. By this Act and the Royal Charter issued under its provisions, the Queen's University was dissolved, and the new Royal University constituted which, whatever be its shortcomings, has certainly surpassed in its general success and popularity the most sanguine expectations of its founders. That success is due, in the first place, to the fact that the University grants its degrees to all matriculated students, no matter where or by whom educated, if they "satisfy the Senate that they are qualified on point of learning to obtain the same ;" and we are told on official authority that no less than 3130 persons presented themselves at the various Academical Examinations for the year 1888. Secondly, the Senate is enabled to offer from its Parliamentary grant, which is yearly to be expended in exhibitions, scholarships, studentships, and other prizes, a very considerable sum of money, as rewards for high proficiency in the various subjects of examination. At the same time, with a view to secure, as far as possible, these prizes for the students of unendowed colleges and schools, it has been most wisely pro-

vided by Act of Parliament that no student holding any exhibition or other valuable prize in any University or College endowed with public money shall hold any of the exhibitions or other prizes of the Royal University without taking the value of such previous exhibition or prize into account and deducting the same from the value of the Royal University prize or exhibition. By this means the prize money is to some extent secured for the successful students, who are trained in the unendowed colleges, or by private tutors.

The statutes also empower the Senate to elect twenty-nine Fellows, with a salary of £400 a year each ; but if the Fellow be a Fellow or Professor of any other College or University endowed with public money, his salary in such other institution must be deducted from £400, and he can only receive the difference from the Royal University. By this provision, although half the Fellowships are assigned to the Queen's Colleges, the amount of money which they receive from the Royal University does not average more than about £80 a year for each Fellowship. On the other hand, the twelve Fellows at present assigned to University College, Stephen's Green, and the Single Fellow assigned to Magee College, Derry, receive each £400 a year, which to that extent provides an indirect endowment for the professors of these two Colleges.

This system, however, of indirect endowment has two serious drawbacks. In the first place it is altogether inadequate to place these Colleges on a footing of equality with the Queen's Colleges, and in the second place, it seriously interferes with the due performance of the primary function of the Royal University as an Examining University. These are two points which we must be allowed to develop at some length, and for this reason, until these two defects are remedied, neither the Catholic students, nor the general body of the students coming for their degrees to the Royal University, can or ought to be satisfied, because, as a matter of fact, they can have neither equality nor perfect fair play. The prizes and degrees of the Royal University are, with the restrictions already explained, open to all comers—to the private student, to the students of the Unendowed Colleges, and also to the students of the Queen's Colleges, and of Trinity College, from which last they come in very considerable numbers, when there is anything likely to be gained thereby ; and they have the additional advantage of being on the spot even for the honour and degree examinations. Now, in Trinity College they have enormous revenues, splendid buildings, a highly-trained and highly-paid and most efficient staff of professors ; they have all the appliances of study, which every year are becoming more elaborate and more expensive. They

have similar aids to learning provided at the public expense in the Queen's Colleges—professors, buildings, books, and apparatus of every kind. Some £10,500 a year, in fact, is spent in procuring for each of these Colleges all these elaborate and indispensable aids, both animate and inanimate, to the acquisition of knowledge.

Surely the heads or defenders of these institutions will not say that the money spent in procuring this splendid educational machinery is not well spent. Be it so, then. But can the students who have none of these things provided for them from the public purse, who must, in fact, go against their consciences or do without them either wholly or in part—can these students, when they come up to the Royal University to be examined with their rivals from Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges, be regarded as fairly matched in this race for honour and reward? Surely no one will venture to assert it.

Then, again, in many cases the Queen's College students can gain a double set of prizes—first in the Royal University, and afterwards in the Queen's College. "A student who has obtained an exhibition in the Royal University is eligible for a scholarship or an exhibition in the Queen's Colleges,"\* and no deduction will in that case be made, or, indeed, can be made, if the student gains his exhibition *first* in the Royal University, and *then* goes down to one of the Queen's Colleges and stands his examination for another exhibition or scholarship. Students, therefore, coming from the unendowed Colleges can get only one exhibition, whilst the Queen's College student of the same standing, and perhaps less knowledge, can gain two exhibitions, or an exhibition and scholarship for one year, on condition of attending his course of lectures in the Queen's College, which is the very thing that a conscientious Catholic will not and cannot do. Is this equality or fair play?

It is true, indeed, that University College has the advantage of having some twelve of the salaried Fellows of the Royal University assigned to it to teach in its halls. But this is the only advantage it has. It has not, like each of the Queen's Colleges, £1500 a year to offer in prizes to its students. It has no buildings erected at the public expense, no libraries, no museums, no laboratories—so essential for medical and scientific teaching—no apparatus of any kind, no paid officers, none of the other aids to learning which are so liberally supplied to the Queen's Colleges. Surely this is not equality or fair play; and surely the Catholic students of University College in this matter have a grievance that impera-

\* See Dr. Moffat's Report for 1884-5, p. 17, and Dr. Porter's Evidence before the Commission of 1884, p. 4.

tively calls for redress. But there are other Catholic Colleges which do more work and better work than either Cork or Galway, that have a still greater grievance, for University College gets something, but they get nothing at all. Last year, 1888-89, there were only 41 students in the Faculty of Arts in the Queen's College, Cork, and 55 in Galway. During the last five years these Art Students of Cork College gained in the Royal University 21 exhibitions and 65 honours; the Galway men during the same period gained 11 exhibitions and 52 honours; whilst University College, Stephen's Green, gained 44 exhibitions and 168 honours; and Blackrock University College secured nearly as many—37 exhibitions and 118 honours. It will thus be seen that of the highest kind of educational work each of the Catholic Colleges has done more than the two Queen's Colleges taken together. Clongowes, Carlow, Mungret, St. Malachy's, Belfast, and other Catholic Colleges have likewise a considerable number of University students, and frequently win the highest places in the lists of the Royal University. But not one of these colleges has one shilling of endowment, direct or indirect, from the public purse.

Is this equality, or fair play, or justice, or public economy, or anything else that it ought to be? Will the Government perpetuate this state of things, or will they not rather give the money where the work is now done without it, and where it will be much better done with it; or, if they will retain Cork and Galway—as we think they ought to do—then, in the name of justice and common sense let them, as the Bishops so often asked, so modify the constitution of these colleges that the Catholics of these two provinces can safely utilize them, and then we shall in a few years find them as successful in the South and West as Belfast has been in the North. Those who are most intimately acquainted with the working of the Royal University feel this injustice and this inequality most keenly, and we have reason to believe that there is not a single representative of the Queen's Colleges on the Senate of the Royal University who would not gladly see something done to remedy this glaring inequality. The Royal University has done this one signal service at all events: it has proved to the world that the students of our Catholic colleges can more than hold their own against all comers if they get anything like fair play; and it has also served to place in a clearer light before the world the great disadvantages under which our Catholic colleges necessarily send up their students to its examinations.

The second great drawback to the full success of the Royal University arises from the fact that its Fellows are at once teachers and examiners—that is, examiners both of their own

students and of outsiders, who have not the advantage of attending to the course of lectures given by the examiner in the very subject in which he examines. This system is intrinsically dangerous to the impartiality of the examinations, for no matter how painstaking and conscientious the examiner may be, he is naturally inclined to set those questions which are before his own mind with special prominence, and to which he most likely called special attention in his own lectures. It is very obvious that in that case a student attending the course of lectures given by the examiner will have in most subjects a very decided advantage over the student who never heard that examiner open his lips. And when in answer to the questions put the examiner gets back his own views, he is more likely to think them correct in those subjects where a divergence of opinion is inevitable than the views of other men. It is very difficult, therefore, for the examiner to act with perfect impartiality as judge between the students taught by himself and those taught by another person in the same subjects. Even his very anxiety to be honest may cause him to be unfair to his own men, as we know to have sometimes happened, but generally speaking it will be the other way; an unconscious bias for his own views and opinions will lead him to set his own favourite questions, and to give perhaps more than their due weight to those answers in which they are carefully reproduced to his own great mental delectation. Considerations of this character are not forgotten by the Senators of the Royal University, and it is an undoubted fact that they are most anxious, as far as possible, to secure a set of examiners who would have nothing to do with the teaching of any of the candidates in those subjects in which they examine. With this view the Senate of the Royal University quite recently made a regulation that the examiners should not continue to examine in the same subject for a longer period than four consecutive years. This was done partly to give outsiders a chance, and partly to prevent the examinations running in the same groove for an indefinite period, with the obvious result that grinders and clever students made themselves perfectly up beforehand in all the points and crotchetts of the examiner as exhibited in his questions and in his lectures. Yet an eminent Dublin doctor, who is a Senator of the Royal University, and also a professor in one of the Dublin Schools of Medicine, bitterly complained of this regulation, because, although there were eight medical examiners of the Royal University in that school, yet in their turn they should have to vacate the office at least one year out of five, and thereby lose the salary which, it was alleged, was given to the examiners as an indirect endowment for that particular School of Medicine. This is precisely the root of the evil. The system of

indirectly endowing a school or college by giving large salaries to its professors as University examiners, with the duty of testing the relative merits of their own pupils and of outsiders, is essentially a dangerous and unsatisfactory system. It cannot last in the Royal University, and it must be changed in the interests of justice and fair play. Endow the working colleges by all means, so as to place them on a footing of equality in coming up for the honours and rewards of the University, but let it be done some other way.

The present arrangement of Fellowships, as a means of giving a small indirect endowment to one or two Colleges, was never intended to be permanent—it was a makeshift for the time, and served a useful purpose for a while, but the sooner it is got rid of the better for all parties concerned. The Archbishop of Dublin stated some years ago, as well as we recollect, that it was a system essentially based on injustice. We are very far from assenting to that proposition, but we think it is dangerous and open to abuse in spite of all the precautions that the Senate has undoubtedly adopted to prevent by every means in its power any possibility of unfairness. It is said by the defenders of the present system that in most subjects it is impossible to get competent University examiners, who are not also teachers of the same subjects, and some of whose pupils would not present themselves at the examinations of the Royal University. That may be—but the danger, at least, should be minimized. It is a standing rule of the Intermediate examinations, that no examiner can examine his own pupils in any subject which he has taught them; and we do not see why a similar rule could not apply to University examinations, with, perhaps, a very few exceptions.

It must be borne in mind, too, that although the first set of Fellows in the Royal University were elected by the Senate without examination, still the Act of Parliament provides that the Fellowships, like the other prizes of the University, shall be open to all students matriculating, or who have matriculated in the University; and the scheme *may propose* that they shall be awarded in respect of either relative or absolute proficiency, &c. The Senate is anxiously awaiting the time when it will be free to throw open the Fellowships, like all other prizes, to the competition of its own graduates; and there is no doubt that such free competition would be for the “Advancement of Learning in Ireland.” But this can never be done while the Senate continues to impose the obligation of teaching in certain colleges on a fixed number of the Fellows. Suppose a number of vacancies occurred, as they did lately in University College, and a Belfast graduate, or two or three of them in succession happened to win the Fellowships, it would be highly inconvenient to send

them to teach in University College, Stephen's Green, and if the Senate did not do so that institution would loose the endowment previously derived from these Fellowships. It is obvious, therefore, that the existing system of indirect endowment is unsatisfactory in many ways, and must, in fact, be done away with as soon as possible.

And now arises the most important question of all—What is to take its place? We have neither the right nor the duty to undertake to give a positive answer to this weighty question. But the past history of the question will enable us to guess very well, what will not do, and even to conjecture with some probability, certain concessions that would certainly tend to a solution of the difficulty.

First of all, it must be borne in mind that the Irish Catholics in this matter of University Education now demand, and have always demanded, to be placed on a footing of equality—perfect equality—with their fellow-subjects of other religious denominations. This has again been asserted in all the resolutions drawn up by the Irish prelates for the last forty years, and it has been asserted with more emphasis of late years than ever. Many persons, it is well known, are by no means over-anxious to press the Catholic claims in this matter on the Imperial Parliament, lest perchance Parliament might at length do justice to Ireland in this matter, and thereby weaken the argument in favour of Home Rule. If Mr. Balfour, after his declaration in the House of Commons, can not, or will not, induce his party to settle this question, then all we can say is, that such a fact will furnish an unanswerable argument in favour of the need of Home Rule for Ireland, and will strike a heavier blow at the Union than it ever received before. If the thing, as all concede, ought to be done, and you admit that still you cannot do it in London, then, in the name of common sense, let us try our hands in Dublin. At any rate, our failure cannot be more signal than yours has been.

But what, it may be asked, is this equality that you want? How are we to measure or to gauge it? We think it is mainly a matter of statistics. What is the actual number of Catholic and non-Catholic University students in Ireland, including the students of Maynooth, who will and ought to graduate in Arts where they can do so in a becoming way? And, secondly, What would be the relative proportion of these students, if the Catholics had got for the last generation the same facilities for obtaining University education as their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen? Let these questions be answered, and it will be found that the Catholics are entitled to get at least as large an endowment as all non-Catholic students taken together. If Trinity College gets £40,000 a year, are not the Catholics en-

titled to as much? Nay, they should, in fair play, get more, for the endowments of Trinity College are reserved for the wealthier classes, who, as a rule, are perfectly well able to take care of themselves, and go anywhere they choose for a University education. It must be borne in mind, too, that a much larger number of Roman Catholics would strive to secure a University degree, both of the professional and non-professional classes, if the same facilities for acquiring a University education were offered to them as are offered to their Protestant fellow-subjects. It is the case in Scotland, where there is one University student for 860 of the population; and why should it not be also the case in Ireland, where at present the proportion is only one in 2800 of the population? There is no doubt, too, that with the more equal distribution of property in Ireland, and the increasing wealth and independence of the middle classes, a much greater number of Catholics especially will, in the coming years, try to give their sons a University education than have attempted to do so in the past. All these considerations go to show that at least as ample provision should be made for the endowment of Catholic education in the future as has already been made for the endowment of non-Catholic. If the question of principle is once honestly and fairly conceded, then all must admit that the educational provision made should be adequate and liberal, if it were only to make some reparation for the spoliation and injustice of the past.

But there is another point which is far more essential than the amount of the endowment, and that is the conditions under which it is to be given. Here, too, we may learn much from the history of the past. If Mr. Balfour will not follow in the footsteps of Lord Mayo, who offered to charter an independent and self-sufficing University for Catholics, but prefers to follow the example of Sir George Grey, he will do well to take careful note of the objections that were raised to that scheme, and ultimately caused it to be withdrawn. If a Catholic College (without the power of giving degrees) were to be chartered and endowed, the Bishops not only required such an endowment as would place them on a footing of equality with non-Catholics, but also that it should be chartered "in such a manner as to leave the department of teaching Catholics altogether in the hands of Catholics, and under the control of the Bishops, at least in all things appertaining to faith and morals." There can be no doubt that the Bishops will still insist on this as an essential condition. They have always insisted on it; if it were not granted the College, or Colleges, would be only Catholic in name, not in reality. You cannot have the play without Hamlet; you cannot have a Catholic College without effective episcopal

control in those things, which essentially and exclusively appertain to episcopal authority. There may be a possibility of compromise in other things, but not in this. As the Bishops pointed out most distinctly, both to Sir George Grey and Lord Mayo, it would necessarily imply in a Catholic College the power of vetoing the appointment or continuance in office of heterodox or immoral professors, the use of bad or immoral books, as well as all lectures of an anti-Catholic or irreligious tendency. It would, in all probability, be very seldom necessary to exercise this power, but its possession would be an essential safeguard for the working of a Catholic College, and would of itself render it unnecessary in most cases to have recourse to its exercise.

This power, therefore, must *in some way* be secured to the representatives of the Catholic Hierarchy in the government of every Catholic college. But in whom is it to be immediately vested? In the statement submitted by the Archbishop of Cashel and the Bishop of Clonfert, in the name of their colleagues they suggest that this power should be given to the Bishops on the Senate of the Catholic University College; but in the Draft Charter which was sent to Sir George Grey in the name of all the Bishops, and which was probably drawn up by Cardinal Cullen (see his "Collected Works," Vol. II., p. 460), it was proposed: "That the four Roman Catholic Archbishops for the time being shall be visitors of the said college, and their authority shall be supreme in questions regarding religion or morals, and in all other things in the said college."

There can be no doubt that the latter would be the simplest and perhaps the most satisfactory way of securing to the Bishops that supreme control in all those things relating to faith and morals which has been indicated above. It would be found very inconvenient in practice to give to the episcopal members of the Senate a power which was not shared by their clerical or lay colleagues on the same Board. No doubt the members of the Senate—especially of a Catholic Senate—would generally defer at once to the ascertained views of the Bishops on questions of this kind. But by reserving an appeal to the archiepiscopal visitors, if any difficulty arose, and holding their decision as final, every objection would be removed, and the rights of the Hierarchy in faith and morals would be effectively safeguarded. And surely when there is question of a Catholic College nothing can be more natural than to have ecclesiastical Visitors, and it might very fairly be assumed that they would not act in any narrow or illiberal spirit, and that whatever might be their prejudices, as Churchmen or politicians, when they were appealed to as judges, they would temper justice with mercy, and act in a spirit of large-minded equity. It has been suggested that in that case it

would be useful to add to the four Catholic Archbishops one or two of the Catholic judges whose knowledge and experience would be valuable on questions of law, and who, doubtless, would not be over-anxious to mix themselves up in questions of faith and morals. The supreme control would still be effectively secured according to Catholic principles to the episcopal authority. This is a point on which we cannot offer any definite opinion; but it is obvious that in the way which the Bishops themselves have indicated in the Draft Charter may be found a simple and easy solution of this critical question.

It was also provided by the same Draft Charter that the "four Visitors shall be trustees of all property belonging to the College." They were also to be *ex-officio* perpetual governors of the College, and eight other prelates were to be associated with them as life-governors of the institution; but it was not proposed to give a share in the "government" to any layman or cleric of the second order. Many people will doubtless consider that a Senate composed exclusively of Bishops is more suited for the government of an ecclesiastical college than of a Catholic University College, primarily established and endowed with public money for the education of laymen. And it is satisfactory to find that in their negotiations with Sir George Grey, the Bishops did not insist on this point, and were ready to admit a certain number of laymen to a share in the government of the College, but they preferred to have them elected by the Senate itself rather than by the Convocation of Graduates.

The important point is that, although the Bishops would prefer a Catholic University of their own, with the power of granting degrees, they were willing to accept an Incorporated College within the new University endowed by Government so as to place it on a footing of equality with other institutions, and at the same time with effective episcopal control over its teaching, its books, and its morals. There is, we presume, no reason, either in policy or the nature of things, why Mr. Balfour could not incorporate a Catholic college as well as Sir George Grey; and there is every reason in the nature of things why a Conservative statesman should be more friendly to such an institution than either a Liberal or a Radical—the latter being, as a rule, the avowed champions of a mixed or godless education. It was, in fact, a Conservative, Sir R. Inglis, who first applied to the Queen's Colleges the opprobrious epithet of "godless" colleges.

And if a central Catholic College is to be chartered, there can be no real objection to allow the Chartered College to affiliate a limited number of other Catholic Colleges to itself. The Government in 1866 alleged that this was the peculiar privilege

of a University, forgetting that it was proposed in 1846 by the Government of the day to allow the Queen's Colleges to affiliate to themselves certain medical schools as tributaries and feeders.\* This affiliation after all really means very little, and can hardly lead to any serious abuse in lowering of the educational standard, seeing that neither the students of the Central College, nor of the affiliated colleges, can obtain any University degrees or diplomas, or certificates, except by passing the examinations of an external and perfectly independent tribunal, which is open to all comers on equal terms. Let the Senate, or other governing body of the Incorporated College, fix, subject to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant, the conditions and privileges of affiliation, restricting it carefully to those institutions where the staff, the numbers, the appliances, and the work already accomplished, will clearly show that they are competent to afford University instruction to their students. Let them be required, if necessary, to come up for certain courses of lectures to the Central College; let some, but not all, the scholarships and exhibitions of the Central College be thrown open for competition amongst the entire body of the students of the affiliated colleges, and be tenable for one year in the affiliated college, but for a second or third year only in the Central College. We do not see how there can be any objection to such a system of affiliation so conditioned and restricted. It has nothing at all to do with the religious question, and we are quite certain that it would greatly tend to the development and success of the Central College, as well as to the general advancement of learning in Ireland.

Let there be by all means but one Central College thoroughly well equipped for all the educational work, which it will have to perform. Let it have a complete staff of competent professors with liberal salaries, for otherwise the services of the most competent men cannot be secured. We do not want any endowment for theological chairs out of the taxpayers' money; let the theological faculty, as at present, be confined to the College of Maynooth. But a very large sum will be required for the purchase or construction of suitable collegiate buildings, and an equally large sum for their complete equipment—that is, including library, museum, laboratories, and all the other varied and expensive educational appliances necessary in the medical and scientific departments. £100,000 was granted by Parliament as a first instalment for the building of the Queen's Colleges, and they have been receiving large sums for maintenance every year since. It would take a very considerable sum to build a hall at all approaching in grandeur the magnificent library of Trinity

---

\* See Sir James Graham's "Official Memorandum," Jan. 1846.

College. Yet this is a thing that can hardly be done piecemeal—it ought to be done at once.

Such a college thoroughly equipped and amply endowed would, in a short time, attract to its halls all the Catholic youths in Ireland seeking a University education. We do not believe there are fifty Catholics in all Ireland who would by preference send their sons either to Trinity College or the Queen's Colleges if they had such an institution in Dublin. It is not for love of mixed education that a few persons do send their sons to these colleges at present, but because many of them have practically no choice. Such a great Catholic College would realize in a brief time Cardinal Newman's lofty ideal by its influence in raising the intellectual tone of Society, in cultivating the public mind, in purifying the national taste, in supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm, and fixed aims to popular aspiration, in giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, in facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. Residence for a shorter or longer period in this clear and pure atmosphere of sober thought should be made indispensable for obtaining all its higher academic prizes.

This is our grievance—that at present we have examinations enough and to spare in the Royal University; but we have no adequate means of preparing for them—no centre of light and culture for the teaching and residence of our students, which alone can give a truly liberal education. Residence without examinations, said Newman, come nearer to the idea of a University than examinations without residence. On this point we have very striking official testimony from Lord Emly, the present distinguished Vice-Chancellor of the Royal University. "For the majority of the people (of Ireland)," he says, "not one endowed lay college exists, and consequently the majority of our students of the Royal University are absolutely shut out from university and college life. They have to compete with their fellow-countrymen—English, Irish, and Scotch—and enter into the combat of life at grievous disadvantage. Until these students, who are now scattered through Stephen's Green, Blackrock, Carlow, and other unendowed colleges, badly equipped, insufficiently manned, and struggling with penury, are united together in a college, *in all respects equal to Trinity College*, they cannot be on an intellectual level with their fellow-countrymen. We have a striking instance of this inferiority before our eyes. Look at our University calendar; you will be struck by the fact that while in other branches of the University course the students of the unendowed colleges have earned a fair proportion of prizes and honours in mathematical science they have hardly won any." Why? for want of suitable appliances and competent professors.

Yes, that is exactly what we want—"a thoroughly equipped college," in all respects equal to Trinity College. This is not, perhaps, the place to discuss its constitution or its government. Mr. Balfour has before him, in the proposals submitted to Sir George Grey and in the Draft Charter, ample means of ascertaining what is likely to be accepted as a satisfactory working arrangement. Lord Mayo, too, laid down one invaluable principle, equally applicable, whether there be question of a Catholic College or of a Catholic University. "If, therefore, a Catholic University is founded, it should be constituted in such a manner that, while it would be almost independent of State control, it would be subject to a constant influence of public opinion, and governed by a body who, acting in the light of day, would be, likely to frame its rules and conduct its teaching so that the new University (or College) would at once enter into active competition on equal terms with the older Universities" or Colleges of the kingdom.

There is not a single clause in this sentence that does not enumerate an important principle, to which no friend of education can reasonably take exception. No University College, and least of all a Catholic College, should be a mere Government *lycée*, managed by a Minister of Public Instruction, or by any other official of the Government. The interference of the Government ought to be limited to two things—to start it and keep it in working order; or, better still, to endow and constitute it so that the institution will be self-governing and self-sustaining, and thus be enabled to keep itself in working order. Competition and publicity will do the rest. Hence we think that the principle of independence of State control laid down in the first paragraph is an admirable one. The less the Government has to do with such an institution once it is fairly started the better. No doubt it is the right and the duty of the Government to see that the country gets value for its money, and that a College endowed from the public purse does not become the nursery of sloth and incompetence. But the examinations of such a body as the Royal University will effectively and clearly tell the world what is the quantity and quality of the work done. It has already shown this in the case of the Queen's Colleges. Belfast has been shown to be a successful institution; so successful that no one grudges its endowment, or questions its right to what it has, or even to more, if necessary, for its efficient working. The Royal University has already done the same for our Catholic Colleges. It has shown clearly the quantity and quality of the work done, and will, in the near future, as we hope, be a still more efficient and impartial *jury d'examen* for all the rival colleges in the country.

But it is also of supreme importance that the Government should commit the management of the new College to a body that will command the public confidence, both as Catholics and as Educationalists. The "advancement of learning on a sound Catholic basis" is the whole purpose of its existence ; and this, doubtless, will be best secured by the choice of moderate men representing the various political parties, but about whose Catholicity and culture and educational experience there can be no question.

It will be observed that the prelates always demanded that the Queen's Colleges should be so modified as to make them practically Denominational Colleges. In the case of Belfast that is so already—not, indeed, in theory, but certainly in practice ; and therefore Belfast is a success. It has been so from the beginning. They began there with four Catholic students who matriculated there in the year 1849-50 ; for the next twenty-one years the average number was only three ; and we believe that is about the number down to the present time. The staff was from the very beginning mainly Presbyterian ; some few, it is true, were Episcopalian, but there was only one Catholic, and his might be called an honorary chair, given to save appearances. It was the chair of Celtic, which was filled by John O'Donovan, the illustrious editor and translator of the "Annals of the Four Masters." But the working staff then and since has been to a great extent Presbyterian. Dr. Henry, the first President, was a Presbyterian ; Dr. Andrews, the Vice-President, was a Presbyterian ; and the majority of the remaining officers and professors were Presbyterians. Using the wider inclusive term of Protestant, every single officer and professor on the establishment, with the single exception of O'Donovan, was a Protestant, and that has been the practice down to the present time. There can be no difficulty about giving Belfast to the Presbyterians ; it is theirs already, and they know it well, and have claimed its Presidency as such from Mr. Balfour.

The question is about Cork and Galway. Is it statesman-like to leave them as they are in the midst of a Catholic population, who would most gladly avail themselves of the educational facilities which they afford if they were conducted on denominational principles ? Let them become Catholic as Belfast is Protestant, governed by Catholics, taught by Catholics, and frequented by Catholics, with the sanction of their pastors, and all will be well. Let there be, by all means, a conscience clause which will secure, as Lord Mayo proposed, "that no religious influence should be brought to bear on students who belonged to another faith." If any non-Catholic students living in Cork or Belfast choose to attend lectures in these colleges when

under Catholic management, so long as they are endowed with public money, they cannot reasonably be excluded—at least so long as they have no college of their own in the same city. And they are entitled to be secured against any undue religious influence being brought to bear upon them against their own wish, or the wish of their parents and guardians. They are entitled to this much; but they are entitled to no more. They have Trinity College if they are Episcopilians; they have Belfast if they are Presbyterians; but it cannot reasonably be expected that they should also have Cork and Galway governed and officered according to their views, so as to meet their wants. The Catholics also, who compose the great bulk of the population, especially in these two provinces, must be taken account of, and something must be done to provide for them so as to meet their wants and wishes. They ask for nothing unreasonable, for nothing, strictly speaking, exclusive—they merely ask for equality; give us in our way as much as you give our Protestant fellow-subjects in their way, that is all.

There is one objection we heard brought against this scheme, that considerable private endowments for various useful purposes were given to Cork College, especially as a mixed college, and on the faith that it would continue to be a mixed college, and which never would have been given by the donors if they imagined it were to become a practically Catholic college. It would be unjust and unfair, they say, to divert these legacies to purposes for which they were never intended. Our answer is that it would be still more unfair to allow such a reason to obstruct the performance of a great act of public justice. There need be no shadow of wrong done to these benefactors of Cork or Galway either, if it has any. If either themselves or their representatives should object to the proposed changes in the constitution of these colleges, then, we say, let the Government pay them over the amount of the original benefaction, whatever it was, and they cannot complain of the least shadow of wrong or injustice. So far as they are concerned, they get back their own to do what they please with, and they can ask for nothing more in reason.

There is a double argument of the greatest weight in favour of this change, first, that it is due as a matter of plain justice to Catholics, for otherwise they will not be placed on an equality with non-Catholics. But there is the second equally imperative argument, that under the present system these two colleges are a failure, and will continue to be a failure so long as that system is continued. It does not need many words to prove this proposition. It has been proved again and again, and has, indeed, been repeatedly admitted by friends as well as by enemies. The Rev. John Scott Porter, in his evidence before a Royal Com-

mission, so far back as March, 1857, says : " I do not think that the number now attending all the three Queen's Colleges as great—certainly not greater—than ought to be found in one of the three if they had succeeded as their founders anticipated, and as we their friends expected." The numbers, however, in Belfast has, since that period, steadily increased ; especially of late years, its success has been very marked. On the other hand, Cork and Galway have been going from bad to worse. The examinations of the Royal University conclusively prove that some of the Catholic colleges which do not derive a shilling from the public purse do better work, and have more students in their halls than either of these richly-endowed colleges which cost the nation nearly £12,000 a year each.

Mr. Balfour, if he is to be taken as quite serious in the speech which he made on the 2nd of December, at Partick, places himself in a very inconsistent position. He practically admits everything that we have been arguing for in these pages, in favour of Catholics—indeed, he makes a stronger case for justice to Catholics than any Minister ever made before, yet declares it is absolutely impossible for him to do anything except with general consent, and so hampers his proposals with extraordinary conditions that it is impossible to regard them as anything but illusory. He finds that there are four colleges in Ireland enjoying public endowments, yet, although the Catholics form the great majority of the population, only one in seven of the students in these colleges belong to the Catholic faith. He admits that for conscience sake they have absented themselves from these colleges, and prefer at considerable sacrifice and expense to attend their own unendowed colleges in Dublin and elsewhere. There are, at least, one thousand Catholics receiving a University education in these institutions, while there are not two hundred and fifty in the four richly-endowed State colleges. He admits that, as we pointed out, Trinity College, though not exclusively Protestant, is mainly a seat of Protestant learning, having only six per cent. of its students Roman Catholic. It is, in fact, now what it has always been a great Protestant institution in its composition, flavour, and complexion. He admits that Belfast, though in theory unsectarian, is practically a Presbyterian College, in which the vast majority of the students are Presbyterian, and a great number of them are being educated for the Presbyterian ministry. He has nothing at all to say in favour of Cork and Galway, and his silence is their strongest condemnation. He admits, too, that in Ireland the current of popular feeling is strongly in favour of denominational colleges and schools of every kind. The present, he admits, is not a creditable state of things. The Roman Catholics ought to get a thoroughly

well-equipped college, so as to obviate their undoubtedly conscientious objections to the existing institutions. But, admitting all this, he will not touch the question except with the consent of all parties in the State.

If Mr. Balfour merely said that he was not prepared to make this a Cabinet question, seeing the avowed attitude of many of those for whose benefit this great boon is intended, we confess that in our opinion he could not be blamed. No one can expect him to forge a weapon which might be used to strike down his own Government, and it has been avowed that it would most assuredly be so used if opportunity offered. As a matter of fact, too, we think his proposals are more likely to meet with general acceptance when his adversaries know that they can be withdrawn without injury to the strength and prestige of the Government.

But the Minister goes much further than this, and lays down three conditions precedent to any action on his part, which he frankly admits are altogether unlikely to be fulfilled. First, he requires his proposals to be cordially accepted as a solution of higher educational difficulty; secondly, his adversaries must not take advantage of his proposals as a means of striking a political blow at the Government; and thirdly, there must be a general consensus of opinion amongst Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen in favour of granting this particular boon to the Roman Catholics. Heretofore it was considered enough to have the opinion of the majority in Parliament in favour of a measure, but we must now have the general opinion of three Kingdoms in favour of this particular measure, including, we presume, extreme Radicals and extreme Orangemen. We are not disposed to be too hard on Mr. Balfour's conditions, because we know the difficulties he has to deal with, and the prejudices he has to overcome. But the least we might expect is, that without at all endangering his Government, he might make an honest effort to solve this question. Coercion is not the whole duty of a Minister. Distributive justice has something to do with it. Has not he himself declared that "there is no task to which the Government of the United Kingdom might more fitly devote itself than that of passing measures for the amelioration of the condition of our brethren in Ireland, which might raise to prosperity those in misery and diminish the friction which unhappily exists between the classes?" This is a lofty purpose, but how is it to be accomplished? Not surely by Drainage Bills, or Railway Bills, or even Land Purchase Bills alone. There is another means—a most efficacious means—of elevating the Irish people that the Minister, both in justice and policy, is bound to adopt. "It is indisputable," said Sir Lyon Playfair, a most competent authority, "that poor countries require greater facilities for education than

rich ones; and that the *only way* in which a poor country with no natural resources can be made prosperous is by extending the demand for intellectual labour, so as to compensate for the absence of material industry. . . . . With small material resources, except those for agriculture, it is above all things essential that the intellectual resources of Ireland should supplement her natural resources."

Let Mr. Balfour make an honest effort to give us the capital necessary to work these rich intellectual resources of Ireland, which we so much want. Of the 715 candidates for examination in Arts in the Royal University, only 173 came from the endowed Colleges during the year 1887-88; the remaining 542 came from the unendowed Colleges or from private tuition. It is just and wise to give these students the same material advantages to aid in developing their intellectual resources as the minority already possess. It is something far more important, and more statesmanlike than either drainage or railways in the congested districts. Let us hope that Mr. Balfour in his latest speech was only striving to educate his own followers. He knows well that on this question the Union is on its trial, and that if the Imperial Parliament persistently denies us, Irish Catholics, those educational advantages which he and every other statesmen of name admits we are entitled to, so much the worse for the claim of that Imperial Parliament to rule Ireland. If the men who keep the vast revenues of Trinity College intact will give nothing to the Catholics of Ireland, the day will surely come when Trinity College will have to disgorge and give us our proportionate share. Mr. Balfour has already proved that as an administrator he is not afraid of Mr. Healy or Mr. Davitt, and he need not fear them in this matter either. There is a limit beyond which even they dare not go. It is a noble task for any statesman—to overcome prejudice and religious intolerance, to diffuse the blessings of equal and impartial law throughout the Empire, and accomplish that task, so often tried in vain, of doing justice to Irish Catholics in this matter of University Education by placing them on a footing of perfect equality with their fellow-citizens of other religious denominations.

JOHN HEALY, D.D., Senator of the Royal University.

## ART. II—DARWINISM.

*An Exposition of the Theory of Natural Selection, with some of its Applications.* By ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.L.S., &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1889.

ACCORDING to promise, we now propose to consider carefully the above interesting volume, briefly noticed by us in our last issue. To consider it carefully, however, it is by no means necessary to pass in review any large portion of the mass of details and varied subjects it contains. It will be amply sufficient for our purpose to note certain of the author's essential principles which appear to us to bear with decisive effect upon the validity of the hypothesis Mr. Wallace sets out to defend. His defence does merit practical consideration, for though it appears in the guise of an onslaught upon the Anti-Darwinian forces, it is in fact a last defence on the part of the surviving chief of the encompassed and besieged citadel of Darwinism.

Attention and consideration the work must certainly command, owing to the attractive style in which it is written, and the multitude of interesting natural-history details with which it is filled. In these respects it only harmonizes with Mr. Wallace's previous works, all of which are full of charm for the student of nature.

After explaining what he means by "species" and their "origin," Mr. Wallace proceeds to treat, in a succession of chapters, of "the struggle for existence," "variation" and "selection;" certain difficulties and objections; hybridism, coloration, geographical and geological relations, and the question of man.

In his chapter on the struggle for existence, Mr. Wallace makes some excellent remarks on the sufferings of animals. He observes (p. 37) :—

There is, I think, good reason to believe that all this (*i.e.*, certain assertions made by Professor Huxley) is greatly exaggerated; that the supposed "torments" and "miseries" of animals have little real existence, but are the reflection of the imagined sensations of cultivated men and women in similar circumstances; and that the amount of actual suffering caused by the struggle for existence among animals is altogether insignificant. In the first place, we must remember that animals are entirely spared the pain we suffer in the anticipation of death—a pain far greater, in most cases, than the reality. This leads, probably, to an almost perpetual enjoyment of their lives, since their constant watchfulness against danger, and even their actual flight from

an enemy, will be the enjoyable exercise of the power and faculties they possess, unmixed with any serious dread. There is, in the next place, much evidence to show that violent deaths, if not too prolonged, are painless and easy; even in the case of man, whose nervous system is in all probability much more susceptible to pain than that of most animals. In all cases in which persons have escaped after being seized by a lion or tiger, they declare that they suffered little or no pain, physical or mental. A well-known instance is that of Livingstone, who thus describes his sensations when seized by a lion:—"Starting and looking half round, I saw the lion just in the act of springing on me. I was upon a little height: he caught my shoulder as he sprang, and we both came to the ground below together. Growling horribly close to my ear, he shook me as a terrier-dog does a rat. The shock produced a stupor similar to that which seems to be felt by a mouse after the first shake of the cat. It causes a sort of dreaminess, in which there was no sense of pain or feeling of terror, though I was quite conscious of all that was happening. It was like what patients partially under the influence of chloroform describe, who see all the operations, but feel not the knife. This singular condition was not the result of any mental process. The shake annihilated fear, and allowed no sense of horror in looking round at the beast."

This absence of pain is not peculiar to those seized by wild beasts, but is equally produced by any accident which causes a general shock to the system. Mr. Whymper describes an accident to himself during one of his preliminary explorations of the Matterhorn, when he fell several hundred feet, bounding from rock to rock, till fortunately embedded in a snow-drift near the edge of a tremendous precipice. He declares that while falling, and feeling blow after blow, he neither lost consciousness nor suffered pain, merely thinking calmly that a few more blows would finish him. We have, therefore, a right to conclude that when death follows soon after any great shock, it is as easy and painless a death as possible, and this is certainly what happens when an animal is seized by a beast of prey. For the enemy is one which hunts for food, not for pleasure or excitement, and it is doubtful whether any carnivorous animal in a state of nature begins to seek after prey till driven to do so by hunger. When an animal is caught, therefore, it is very soon devoured, and thus the first shock is followed by an almost painless death. Neither do those which die of cold or hunger suffer much. Cold is generally severest at night, and has a tendency to produce sleep and painless extinction. Hunger, on the other hand, is hardly felt during periods of excitement; and when food is scarce the excitement of seeking for it is at its greatest. It is probable, also, that when hunger presses, most animals will devour anything to stay their hunger, and will die of gradual exhaustion and weakness not necessarily painful, if they do not fall an earlier prey to some enemy or to cold.

Now let us consider what are the enjoyments of the lives of most animals. As a rule, they come into existence at a time of year when food is most plentiful and the climate most suitable, that is, in the spring of the temperate zone and at the commencement of the dry

season in the tropics. They grow vigorously, being supplied with abundance of food ; and when they reach maturity their lives are a continual round of healthy excitement and exercise, alternating with complete repose. The daily search for the daily food employs all their faculties, and exercises every organ of their bodies. While this exercise leads to the satisfaction of all their physical needs.

In our own case, we can give no more perfect definition of happiness than this exercise and this satisfaction ; and we must therefore conclude that animals, as a rule, enjoy all the happiness of which they are capable. And this normal state of happiness is not allayed, as with us, by long periods—whole lives often—of poverty or ill-health, and of the unsatisfied longing for pleasures which others enjoy, but to which we cannot attain. Illness, and what answers to poverty in animals—continued hunger, are quickly followed by unanticipated and almost painless extinction. Where we err is, in giving to animals feelings and emotions which they do not possess. To us the very sight of blood, and of torn and mangled limbs, is painful, while the idea of the suffering implied by it is heartrending. We have a horror of all violent and sudden death, because we think of the life full of promise cut short, of hopes and expectations unfulfilled, and of the grief of mourning relatives. But all this is quite out of place in the case of animals, for whom a violent and a sudden death is in every way the best. Thus the poet's picture of

“ Nature red in tooth and claw  
With ravine,”

is a picture, the evil of which is read into it by our imaginations, the reality being made up of full and happy lives, usually terminated by the quickest and least painful of deaths.

We have cited this passage at length, because we consider it a very salutary antidote to the poisonous pessimism with regard to nature which is not unknown even amongst ourselves.

That “natural selection” acts—that, as we have elsewhere said, “it restrains variation within the bounds of physiological propriety”—is what we have constantly affirmed ; and no thoughtful person for centuries past has denied the truth, familiar to the scholastic, that even no trees in a forest are absolutely similar.

What we have also affirmed, and what Mr. Wallace cannot bring evidence to refute, is that variation can neither be indefinite nor unlimited. He shows abundantly that there may be much oscillation on either side of a mean, and this is made especially evident in two diagrams of variations in birds, depicted on pages 63-65. We strongly suspect, however, that close criticism would reduce or invalidate not a few of his instances. We judge this from his diagram of variations in lizards, which is exclusively based upon measurements taken by Professor Milne-Edwards very many years ago, without note of sex and of most doubtful accuracy

as to specific distinctions. These measurements and Mr. Wallace's diagram (p. 48) must be entirely disregarded on these accounts, and such a failure in one instance throws grave doubts and suspicion upon others.

The one supereminent characteristic of Darwinism is that the mere fact of the position it assumes renders refutation extremely difficult. It says the cause of every characteristic organization and every habit or instinct is "utility"—a utility either existing at the present time, or utility in the past to some hypothetical ancestors under some imaginable circumstances. This hypothetical proposition having been affirmed, ignorance is constantly appealed to as evidence in its favour. It is obviously impossible to deny that we are ignorant as to such past possibilities, nor would a Theist seek to maintain that the organization of any animal is futile and useless. Did we all, then, know even by certain revelation that Darwinism was false, the arguments in its favour derived from ignorance and from mere possibilities, would remain as plausible as ever. Thus as to the origin of the mammary gland Mr. Wallace remarks (p. 129), that "the very earliest mammals . . . may have been nourished by a fluid secreted from the interior surface of the marsupial sack. And who can reply that this is impossible, although there is much reason to doubt whether the first mammals had any marsupial sack at all? These appeals to ignorance occur again and again, *usque ad nauseam*.

The case of the Potto, however, the first finger of which is quite rudimentary, remains as significant as ever. All that Mr. Wallace can say in reply to our previous objections, drawn from that source, is (p. 139) that it is an "ancient type," and that its habits and past history are completely unknown. We consider, therefore, the case of the Potto (which must grasp the less securely from the absence of this finger) to be as triumphantly decisive as any such case can be, though, of course, we cannot say that accompanying that character there may not be some favourable peculiarity of heart, lungs, liver, brain, which may give it a physiological superiority. Another still more striking instance of the preservation of an apparently rather harmful characteristic is that power which certain plants possess of forming galls when pierced by the insect Cynips, as mentioned in our last issue,\* although, as we then said, no doubt some Darwinian will explain it by piling hypothesis on hypothesis for the purpose.

It is a notorious fact that, from whatever cause, hybrids are apt to be sterile *inter se*, though they are by no means universally

so. It is also notorious that, from whatever cause, close interbreeding does produce bad effects.

Now, when Mr. Wallace comes to speak (p. 163) of hybrid plants, after mentioning a case in which "after a time the fertility decreased," he adds "presumably from the same cause, too close interbreeding." But the presumption is unwarranted, for it is surely quite as open to me to believe that the infertility in this case was due to the same cause as that which occasions the admitted general infertility of hybrids, which are instances of the very opposite to interbreeding. Mr. Wallace fully admits (p. 195) that changes of colour in animals, produced by the tints of surrounding objects, do occur; but he endeavours to attenuate the admission by saying, that "these facts are comparatively rare and exceptional in their nature,"—as if the admission of the principle that such direct action could take place, had not the most far-reaching consequences. We have sometimes to be grateful to him (and we gladly record it) for exposing the fallacies of some of his Darwinian brothers. Thus he observes (p. 198): "It is curious that, with the small tortoise-shell larva, exposure to light from gilded surfaces produced pupæ with a brilliant golden lustre; and the explanation is supposed to be that *mica* abounded in the original habitat of the species, and that the pupæ thus obtained protection when suspended against micaceous rock. Looking, however, at the wide range of the species, and the comparatively limited area in which micaceous rocks occur, this seems a rather improbable explanation, and the occurrence of this metallic appearance is still a difficulty." All honour to Mr. Wallace for this straightforward admission!

Some very far-fetched and untenable fancies are, however, put forward by him to explain other phenomena. Thus he tells us that the giraffes' heads and horns are liable to be mistaken for broken branches, and evidently supposes (p. 210) that the forked and blood-red tentacle which can be projected from the heads of the caterpillars of certain butterflies, has been formed by gradual growth through its protecting action against enemies. He further tells us that, "perhaps the most perfect example of this kind of protection is exhibited by the large caterpillar of the Royal Persimmon Moth (*Bombyx regia*), a native of the Southern States of North America, and known there as the "Hickory-horned Devil."

It is a large green caterpillar, often six inches long, ornamented with an immense crown of orange-red tubercles, which, if disturbed, it erects, and shakes from side to side in a very alarming manner. In its native country the negroes believe it to be as deadly as a rattle-snake, whereas it is perfectly innocuous. The green colour of the body suggests that its ancestors were once protectively coloured; but

growing too large to be effectually concealed, it *acquired the habit of shaking its head about* in order to frighten away its enemies, and ultimately developed the crown of tentacles as an addition to its terrifying powers.

The faith which would accept such a legend as this as the very truth is past arguing with.

But scepticism and credulity go hand in hand through the whole of this work. At page 215 we read : "The beautiful blue or greenish eggs of the hedge-sparrow, the song-thrush, the blackbird, and the lesser redpole seem, at first sight, especially calculated to attract attention, but *it is very doubtful* whether they are really so conspicuous when seen at a little distance among their usual surroundings"—dark or delicate green leaves. Now, *of course*, the eggs are less conspicuous "when seen at a little distance in the nest," than they are when held in the hand or laid down on a library table. But this fact in no way makes them less conspicuous objects as compared with the eggs of various other birds, which do almost perfectly harmonize with their environment.

In the same way he seeks to account for the instinct which leads so many cuckoos to lay their eggs in the nests of birds whose eggs are similarly coloured, by saying (p. 216), "Those cuckoos which so acted would probably leave most progeny, and so the habit would grow." No doubt Mr. Wallace would similarly account for the very small size of the cuckoo's eggs; but, as Messrs. Geddes and Thomson have lately observed,\* "To say that the small size of the cuckoo's egg is 'an adaptation in order to deceive the small birds,' seems to strain the natural-selection theory to the breaking-point."

The beauty of many birds is explained by Mr. Wallace by the need of each species to easily recognise its kind. Now our position by no means requires us to assert that different species must be so alike that no one of them can recognise its own kind. The differences here referred to are thus useful, and such utility was, no doubt, one amongst the many causes which led to the beauty of birds-of-paradise and humming-birds. As to the latter, the Duke of Argyll most justly remarks :—"A crest of topaz is no better in the struggle for existence than a crest of sapphire. A frill ending in spangles of the emerald is no better in the battle of life than a frill ending in spangles of the ruby." One final cause of such beauties may well have been their ultimate appreciation by human intelligences and by intelligences higher than human. Many concordant utilities may run parallel, and it would be strange indeed if we had to show that

---

\* "Evolution of Sex," p. 277.

any characters were utterly and altogether useless, in order that we might prove *design*. But that the bare and bold utilitarianism of Darwin is not the be-all and end-all of nature, we may cite facts from Mr. Wallace himself to prove. The resemblance of butterflies of different kinds, Darwinians usually explain by the fact that one kind is uneatable, and that the other kind gains impunity by resembling its distasteful class-fellow. But there are swallow-tailed butterflies in Asia and Africa which are both distasteful; yet, though thus alike in this respect, while widely separated geographically, "they have each the same red and black colours," and "are very distinct from all the other butterflies of their respective countries."

Well may Mr. Wallace remark of this fact (p. 235) that "it is curious." He is wonderfully fertile of resources in the way of explanation, so that the most contradictory facts can be equally well explained upon his pet hypothesis—a fact which surely suggests grave doubts as to its validity on the part of impartial readers. After speaking of the unsavoury and offensive nature of many brilliant sea-anemones, and seeking to explain their brilliance as a useful sign to ward off attacks, he adds (p. 265):—"Some tropical fishes, however, seem to have acquired the power of feeding on corals and medusæ; and the beautiful bands and spots, and bright colours, with which they are frequently adorned, may be either protection when feeding in the submarine coral-groves, or may, in some cases, be warning colours to show that they themselves are poisonous and uneatable."

Similarly, he generally explains the formation of domed nests as a means of hiding conspicuous birds within them; but when this course does not appear possible, his fancy is immediately ready to suggest another cause. Thus as to the Maluridæ of Australia he remarks (p. 279):—"Here there can be little doubt the covered nest is a protection from rain or from some special enemies of the eggs." Mr. Wallace's fertile fancy is, indeed, one of his most notable characteristics, and it is displayed in this work in a truly noteworthy manner. Thus, after arguing as to circumstances which might have caused plants to be fertilised by insects, he continues (p. 328):—

Species thus favourably modified *might* begin a new era of development, and while spreading over a somewhat wider area, give rise to new varieties or species, all adapted in various degrees and modes to secure cross-fertilisation by insect agency. But, in course of ages, *some* change of condition *might* prove adverse. Either the insects required *might* diminish in numbers or be attracted by other competing flowers, or a change of climate *might* give the advantage to other more vigorous plants. Then self-fertilisation, with greater means of dispersal, *might* be more advantageous; the flowers *might* become

smaller and more numerous ; the seeds smaller and lighter, so as to be more easily dispersed by the wind ; while some of the special adaptations for insect fertilisation, being useless, would, by the absence of selection and by the loss of economy of growth, be reduced to a rudimentary form. With these modifications the species *might* extend its range into new districts, thereby obtaining increased vigour by the change of conditions, as appears to have been the case with so many of the small-flowered self-fertilised plants. Thus it *might* continue to exist for a long series of ages, till, under *other* changes, geographical or biological, it *might* again suffer from competition or from *other adverse circumstances*, and be at length again confined to a limited area, or reduced to very scanty members.

What *might* not be explained by such chains of imaginary hypotheses ? We are irresistibly reminded of the old tale about the girl found crying beside a well, and who, being asked the reason of her tears, replied, " Oh, sir, I *might* live to be a woman, and I *might* be married, and I *might* have a little girl, and I *might* send her to this well, and she *might* fall in, and *might* be drowned ; and what a shocking thing that would be ! "

Mr. Wallace does not contest the plain fact that dicotyledonous plants appear suddenly in abundance in the Cretaceous period, while in the earlier Mesozoic formations we seem to have, as he admits, " a fair representative of the flora of the period," amongst which were many monocotyledons, and in his diagram (p. 202) he plainly represents the latter group as antedating the former. Yet he appears to favour the view that monocotyledons are degraded dicotyledons.

He endeavours to account for the occurrence of similar plants at very distant stations by the hypothesis (p. 371) of the wind-carriage of their seeds, justly declaring (p. 369) Mr. Darwin's view of an extreme lowering of tropical temperature during comparatively recent times, to be an untenable view. But we cannot believe with our author that the wind could carry sands from Northern Europe to New Zealand or Tierra-del-Fuego, or between Australia and South America. We are confirmed in this disbelief by the fact that closely resembling snakes, lizards, insects, and plants exist in Madagascar and South America, for which no wind agency will, of course, account. We have, indeed, met with no Darwinian hypothesis which will account for it, any more than for the similarity between certain Batrachians of Europe and South America.

But not to linger over a criticism of mere details, we will devote the rest of the space at our disposal to the consideration of three principles, all of which are admitted by Mr. Wallace, but any one of which is simply fatal to that mechanical conception of nature which it is our intention, as ever before, to oppose.

We have, indeed, little need and less desire to oppose Mr. Wallace for his own sake ; for the views peculiar to himself would be, if true, perfectly harmless. We oppose him only because, and in so far as, his work, so unfortunately misnamed, is taken to support true Darwinism, which affirms the bestiality of man, and practically enthrones *unreason* as Lord of the Universe.

The three principles to which it is the main object of this paper to direct attention are—(1) Mr. Wallace's hypothesis as to the development of colour in animals ; (2) his view as to the origin of man ; and (3) his conviction as to the immaterial dynamic side of the bodies which constitute the Material Universe.

The brilliant colours, peculiar markings or structural developments which so commonly distinguish male animals were explained by Darwin through what he called "sexual selection." He believed that the females, by persistently favouring those males which had such peculiarities in the most marked degree, had given rise to races and species such as now we see them. This view Mr. Wallace rejects, arguing that there is no sufficient evidence of females being thus affected, while he reasonably urges the extreme improbability that one uniform caprice of taste should animate all the females of a species for thousands of generations over vast tracts of country, sometimes extending over almost the whole habitable world. Mr. Wallace explains the difference of the sexes in quite another fashion. According to him, the soberness of female birds is due to the action of natural selection, which has eliminated all those which persisted in retaining the bright colours of the other sex. These imprudent females have, he says, been eliminated by the various beasts and birds of prey which were enabled to obtain them, through the conspicuousness of their coloration, while incubating on their nests. The brilliance of the male birds Mr. Wallace attributes negatively to their not practising incubation, and therefore not needing such protection ; while he attributes it positively to general laws of growth and development, ornament being "the natural product and direct outcome of superabundant health and vigour."

He tells us (p. 275) : "There seems to be a constant tendency in the male of most animals—but especially of birds and insects—to develop more and more intensity of colour, often culminating in brilliant blues or greens, or the most splendid iridescent hues. He also quotes (p. 296) with approval the following suggestive remarks of that well-known and eminent naturalist, the Rev. O. Pickard-Cambridge :—"I myself doubt that particular application of the Darwinian theory which attributes male peculiarities of form and structure, colour and ornament, to female predilection. There is, it seems to me, undoubtedly something in the male

organization of a special nature, which, of its own vital force, develops the remarkable male peculiarities so commonly seen, and of no imaginable use to that sex."

In this opinion Mr. Wallace is partly supported by a distinguished American biologist, Mr. Brooks.\* He has directed our attention to cases of coloration in lizards and fishes, which do not incubate, and to domestic birds, which breed in security. He also remarks that the fact of many structures, which are not at all conspicuous, being confined, like gay plumage, to male birds, also indicates the existence of an explanation of a fundamental nature, and one capable of explaining why the females of allied species should often be exactly alike when the males are very different.

It is strange indeed that Mr. Wallace does not appear to see the serious consequences, for his pet theory, which follow from the affirmation of such principles as these. For if the brilliant colours which decorate and distinguish the males of so many birds and insects are the spontaneous outcome of the inner nature of such organisms, how can it be pretended that they are also due to the action of natural selection? But if species thus distinguished do thus owe their distinction to something else than natural selection, then natural selection can no longer be asserted to be the origin of species.

Far more important than Mr. Wallace's treatment of this question, however, are his views concerning the origin of man. As to this, he tells us that even if we allow man's body to have been naturally evolved, it by no means follows that his mental nature has been produced in a similar fashion, and he denies altogether that it can have been due to the action of "natural selection."

He illustrates the position he thus takes up by the following physical analogy (p. 463):—

Upheaval and depression of land, combined with sub-aërial denudations by wind and frost, rain and rivers, and marine denudations on coast-lines, were long thought to account for all the modelling of the earth's surface not directly due to volcanic action; and in the early editions of "Lyall's Principles of Geology" these are the sole causes appealed to. But when the action of glaciers was studied, and the recent occurrence of a glacial epoch demonstrated as a fact, many phenomena—such as moraines and other gravel deposits, boulder clay, erratic boulders, grooved and rounded rocks, and Alpine lake basins—were seen to be due to this altogether distinct cause. There was no breach of continuity, no sudden catastrophe; the cold period

---

\* See his work entitled, "The Law of Heredity: a Study of the Cause of Variation and the Origin of Living Organisms." Baltimore, 1883.

came on and passed away in the most gradual manner, and its effects often passed insensibly into those produced by denudation or upheaval ; yet none the less a new agency appeared at a definite time, and new effects were produced, which, though continuous with preceding effects, were not due to the same causes. It is not, therefore, to be assumed, without proof or against independent evidence, that the later stages of an apparently continuous development are necessarily due to the same causes only as the earlier stages. Applying this argument to the case of man's intellectual and moral nature, I propose to show that certain definite portions of it could not have been developed by variation and natural selection alone, and that, therefore, some other influence, law, or agency is required to account for them. If this can be clearly shown for any one or more of the special faculties of intellectual man, we shall be justified in assuming that the same unknown cause or power may have a much wider influence, and may have profoundly influenced the whole course of this development.

With respect to the mathematical faculty, he asks how its rudiments can have developed into the perfection displayed by a Newton, a La Place, a Gauss or a Cayley. As to this he says (p. 466) :—

It must be remembered we are here dealing solely with the capability of the Darwinian theory to account for the origin of the mind, as well as it accounts for the origin of the body of man, and we must, therefore, recall the essential features of that theory. These are, the preservation of useful variations in the struggle for life ; that no creature can be improved beyond its necessities for the time being ; that the law acts by life and death, and by the survival of the fittest. We have to ask, therefore, what relation the successive stages of improvement of the mathematical faculty had to the life or death of its possessors ; to the struggles of tribe with tribe, or nation with nation ; or to the ultimate survival of one race and the extinction of another. If it cannot possibly have had any such effects, then it cannot have been produced by natural selection.

From the mathematical he turns to the musical and artistic faculties, as to which he observes as follows (p. 468) :—“ As with the mathematical, so with the musical faculty, it is impossible to trace any connection between its possession and survival in the struggle for existence. It seems to have arisen as a *result* of social and intellectual advancement, not as a *cause* ; and there is some evidence that it is latent in the lower races, since, under European training, native military bands have been formed in many parts of the world, which have been able to perform creditably the best modern music.

“ The artistic faculty has run a somewhat different course, though analogous to that of the faculties already discussed. Most savages exhibit some rudiments of it, either in drawing or carving human or animal figures ; but, almost without exception, these

figures are rude and such as would be executed by the ordinary inartistic child. In fact, modern savages are, in this respect, hardly equal to those prehistoric men who represented the mammoth and the reindeer on pieces of horn or bone. With any advance in the arts of social life, we have a corresponding advance in artistic skill and taste, rising very high in the arts of Japan and India, but culminating in the marvellous sculpture of the best period of Grecian history. In the Middle Ages art was chiefly manifested in ecclesiastical architecture and the illumination of manuscripts; but from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries pictorial art revived in Italy, and attained to a degree of perfection which has never been surpassed. This revival was followed closely by the schools of Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, France, and England, showing that the true artistic faculty belonged to no one nation, but was fairly distributed among the various European races.

"These several developments of the artistic faculty, whether manifested in sculpture, painting, or architecture, are evidently outgrowths of the human intellect which have no immediate influence on the survival of individuals or of tribes, nor on the success of nations in their struggles for supremacy or for existence. The glorious art of Greece did not prevent the nation falling under the sway of the less-advanced Romans; while we ourselves, among whom art was the latest to arise, have taken the lead in the colonisation of the world, thus proving our mixed race to be the fittest to survive."

He sums up his views as to these matters in the following very noteworthy manner (p. 474-476):—

The special faculties we have been discussing clearly point to the existence in man of something which he has not derived from his animal progenitors—something which we may best refer to as being of a spiritual essence or nature, capable of progressive development under favourable conditions. On the hypothesis of this spiritual nature, superadded to the animal nature of man, we are able to understand much that is otherwise mysterious or unintelligible in regard to him, especially the enormous influence of ideas, principles, and beliefs over his whole life and actions. Thus alone we can understand the constancy of the martyr, the unselfishness of the philanthropist, the devotion of the patriot, the enthusiasm of the artist, and the resolute and persevering search of the scientific worker after nature's secrets. Thus we may perceive that the love of truth, the delight in beauty, the passion for justice, and the thrill of exultation with which we hear of any act of courageous self-sacrifice, are the workings within us of a higher nature which has not been developed by means of the struggle for material existence.

It will, no doubt, be urged that the admitted continuity of man's progress from the brute does not admit of the introduction of

new causes, and that we have no evidence of the sudden change of nature which such introduction would bring about. The fallacy as to new causes involving any breach of continuity, or any sudden or abrupt change in the effects, has already been shown; but we will further point out that there are at least three stages in the development of the organic world when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action. The first stage is the change from inorganic to organic, when the earliest vegetable cell, or the living protoplasm out of which it arose, first appeared. This is often imputed to a mere increase of complexity of chemical compounds; but increase of complexity, with consequent instability, even if we admit that it may have produced protoplasm as a chemical compound, could certainly not have produced living protoplasm—protoplasm which has the power of growth and of reproduction, and of that continuous process of development which has resulted in the marvellous variety and complex organization of the whole vegetable kingdom. There is in all this something quite beyond and apart from chemical changes, however complex; and it has been well said that the first vegetable cell was a new thing in the world, possessing altogether new powers—that of extracting and fixing carbon from the carbon-dioxide of the atmosphere—that of indefinite reproduction, and, still more marvellous, the power of variation and of reproducing those variations till endless complications of structure and varieties of form have been the result. Here, then, we have indications of a new power at work, which we may term vitality, since it gives to certain forms of matter all those characters and properties which constitute life.

The next stage is still more marvellous, still more completely beyond all possibility of explanation by matter, its laws and forces. It is the introduction of sensation or consciousness, constituting the fundamental distinction between the animal and vegetable kingdoms. Here all idea of mere complication of structure producing the result is out of the question. We feel it to be altogether preposterous to assume that at a certain stage of complexity of atomic constitution, and as a necessary result of that complexity alone, an *ego* should start into existence—a thing that feels, that is conscious of its own existence.\* Here we have the certainty that something new has arisen—a being whose nascent consciousness has gone on increasing in power and definiteness till it has culminated in the higher animals. No verbal explanation, or attempt at explanation, such as the statement that life is the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm, or that the whole existing organic universe from the *ameeba* up to man was latent in the fire-mist from which the solar system was developed, can afford any mental satisfaction, or help us in any way to a solution of the mystery.

The third stage is, as we have seen, the existence in man of a number of his most characteristic and noblest faculties—those which raise

---

\* No doubt all that Mr. Wallace here really means is that we have distinguished as *consentience*.

him further above the brutes, and open up possibilities of almost indefinite advancement, when faculties could not possibly have been developed by reason of the same laws which have determined the progressive development of the organic world in general and also of man's physical organism.

These three distinct stages of progress from the inorganic world of matter and motion up to man point clearly to an unseen universe—to a world of spirit, to which the world of matter is altogether subordinate. To this spiritual \* world we may refer the marvellously complex forces which we know as gravitation, cohesion, chemical force, radiant force and electricity, without which the material universe could not exist for a moment in its present form, and perhaps not at all, since without these forces, and perhaps others which may be termed atomic, it is doubtful whether matter † itself could have any existence. And still more surely can we refer to it those progressive manifestations of life in the vegetable, the animal, and man—which we may classify as unconscious, conscious, and intellectual life—and which probably depend upon different degrees of spiritual influx. I have already shown that this involves no necessary infraction of the law of continuity in physical or mental evolution, whence it follows that any difficulty we may find in discriminating the inorganic from the organic, the lower vegetable from the lower animal organisms, or the higher animals from the lowest types of man, has no bearing at all upon the question. This is to be decided by showing that a change in essential nature (due, probably, to causes of a higher order than those of the material universe) took place at the several stages of progress which I have indicated—a change which may be none the less real because absolutely imperceptible at its point of origin, as is the change that takes place in the curve in which a body is moving when the application of some new force causes the curve to be slightly altered.

We cordially commend the above passages from Mr. Wallace's book to the careful consideration of our readers. Its author does not, of course, employ the terms of Catholic philosophy, with which he is unacquainted. But, with a few changes of terminology (of which we have suggested one or two), it seems to us to accord marvellously therewith.

Very interesting is it to us to note the substantial harmony which exists between the views here put forward, and those for which we have combated these eighteen years, and which we have recently proclaimed afresh (see "On Truth," p. 419), when we said:—"Science shows us a world, consisting of a number of separate inorganic substances, each being a substance of some definite kind, with special power and properties. It also tells us that each is an actual material substance, informed by an

\* Here probably the term "immaterial" would satisfy Mr. Wallace's requirements.

† Here *materia prima* is evidently not what is referred to.

immaterial energy which is utterly unimaginable and inscrutable in its nature. Each material object is thus regarded as a unity having its material and its immaterial side—a composition of matter and of some form of energy, the both principles giving the substance those powers and properties which make it what it is."

Therein we also urged what we have have so lately re-asserted\* that all analogy is in favour of the existence of a separate immaterial, dynamic principle of individualism, or soul, in every physically distinct living being, and that the existence of the human soul is "the primary and highest truth of physical science."

Such is emphatically the belief of that very estimable and most accomplished naturalist—the author of the misnamed work we are reviewing ; for it is assuredly one of the most anti-Darwinian publications which has appeared for a long time. He boldly and unequivocably declares (p. 477) that, to him, "the whole purpose, the only *raison d'être* of the world—with all its complexities of physical structure, with its grand geological progress, the slow evolution of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and the ultimate appearance of man—was the development of the human spirit in association with the human body." This is a declaration, in other words, of what we almost simultaneously declared ("On Truth," p. 495) :—"A successively increasing purpose runs through the irrational creation up to man. All the lower creatures have ministered to him, and have, as a fact, prepared the way for his existence. Therefore, whatever ends they also serve, they exist especially for him." No doubt, Mr. Wallace would also further, and fully agree with us, that the true end of the world's existence was "the fulfilment of the moral law—a fulfilment to be brought about after what seems an eternity to the imagination, but which reason cannot doubt to have been in its due time and season."

With the exceptions herein drawn out, we must conclude by expressing our admiration for, and our warm approval of, Mr. Alfred Wallace's work, which contains, so far as we have seen, nothing, from cover to cover, which is inconsistent or irreconcileable with a faithful adherence to the teaching of Catholic theology.

ST. GEORGE MIVARR.

---

\* "Dublin Review," October, 1889, p. 275, 276.

ART. III.—ANGLICANISM AND EARLY BRITISH  
CHRISTIANITY.—AN HISTORICAL COMPARISON.

THE fountain of Celtic Christianity in Britain was Rome, and from Rome it flowed hither in three channels. The first was the apostleship exercised by Roman Christians who lived in this island during the Roman occupation; the second was the action of Britons who had become converts at Rome and brought home their new faith; the third, the mission established in South Wales by Pope St. Eleutherius at the instance of Lleirwg, chieftain of the indomitable Silures. No vestige of historical warrant exists to confirm the time-honoured, poetical fictions regarding the advent of St. Paul, St. Philip, or Joseph of Arimathea; the legends connecting these illustrious names with British Christianity dissolve into fable when the finger of research approaches them. The story of Lleirwg or Lucius is so well known that I need not recount it here; two distinct and dissimilar streams of historical testimony, each sufficient of itself to establish veracity, combine to confirm the account commonly received of this prince's relation to early British Christianity—the one the records of the Church, the other the Welsh Chronicles, in which the fervid bards, with Oriental imagery, designate this Silurian potentate as *Lleuver Maur*, “The Great Light.”

The most powerful of the three Christian currents above referred to, both as regards consequence and origin, was that directed to this island by Pope Eleutherius; for, its origin had something of a national movement in it, and its consequence was the organisation of the British Church. The Silures formed a small but distinct tribe of the Britons, remarkable above all for tenacious adherence to their laws, customs, language and religion. They were nominally, but only nominally, subject to Imperial Rome. “*Silurum gens*,” says Tacitus, “non atrocitate, non clementia mutabatur.”\* A people whom neither coercion nor concession could bend, must have had a voice in their prince's action, before he gave them preachers of a new doctrine. Bound by an inviolable and strictly enforced law of Dyvnwal Moelmud,† no new doctrines could be introduced by Lucius without the consent of his people, among whom Bardo-Druidism was then supreme. Hence the Christian mission to Britain at the end of the second century partook of something of the character of a national movement.

\* *Julii Agric. vita cap xviii.*

† See third vol. “Myvyrian Archaiology.”

It is remarkable that the four missionaries sent by Pope Eleutherius into Britain were every one of British nationality. Is there not something crudely absurd then in the theory of a British Church independent of Rome? If the Silures desired such a church could they not have found means to call their own countrymen to preach to them without Papal authority? Manifestly they could, and yet they did not. This ancient tribe, unchanged by Imperial edicts, solicited the persecuted heir of the fisherman for "baptism"—their synonym for Christianity—and he gave them what they asked, as one commissioned to open to them, and to all peoples, the Gate of Light.

It is claimed that the State religion of England—which I will call broadly Anglicanism—is a religious system identical, at least in its main features, with this Early British Church. Anglicanism claims identity also with the Church founded in England by St. Augustine, and likewise proclaims that the British Church was not identical with that of St. Augustine. This is not severely logical, but it is wondrously Anglican.

The object of this paper is to test historically this alleged identity of the Church of England in the nineteenth century with the Church in Britain during the sixth and preceding centuries. And the first test I propose to apply is that of Monasticism—let us examine the relation of these two Churches in regard to this salient religious feature. And first I will take the Church of England. This Church owes her birth to the death of the monastic spirit in England; and on its ruins in this land she rose and thrrove, and she has never restored it. Some few Anglicans may, indeed, think me here refuted by the recent development of Anglican Sisterhoods. But it is quite enough, I think, to wait till Anglicans settle among themselves how far these associations of charitable ladies are really honest Protestantism, or a badly pretentious and exotic imitation of Romanism, before we trouble to characterize them. Protestantism is a protest against the ascetic spirit; and this it has not revived by a few fashionable attempts to give a number of ladies a quaint dress and a common life. Neither is Archdeacon Farrar's recent proposal for a Church of England brotherhood likely to asceticize Protestant effort.

Without the destruction of monasticism there could have been no Church of England as by law established,—the Church we know. The monks were the strongest props of the Papal power in England.

They preache as moche as they maye  
That the people with reverence  
Continue still in obedience  
Of the pope's rule nighte and daye,

Though his works be contrary  
They say that he is goddis vicary  
And of Christe the leftenaunte.

This is the testimony of Roy and Jerome Barlow in 1528; these worthies were two ex-friars, and the quotation given is to be found in "A proper Dyaloge between a Gentillman and a Husbandman," published under the date mentioned.

Besides their papal proclivities, the monks too were guilty of possessing property. This property was taken from them by a venal Parliament, without compensation, contrary to all sound Parliamentary precedent, and generously bestowed upon the plunderers by themselves. The altar was robbed, the dead were robbed, the poor—the living images of Christ—were robbed, and there was nothing to prevent restitution being enforced, but the creation of a bulwark against it. That bulwark was the Established Church of England. Even in Mary's reign, the sniffling hypocrites who bent the knee to Cardinal Pole, refused to repeal the Act of Supremacy until they were assured their sacrilegious spoils would be left with them. The Cardinal consented, murmuring something about Belshazzar, which they construed as a threat; so when Mary died, Elizabeth found an easy pack to muster at her call. Thus perished monasticism in England, thus arose Anglicanism, and what wonder is it then that in Anglicanism there is an abysmal want of the monastic spirit.

I now turn to the Early British Church; and there we shall find that the monastic spirit overflowed. Singular to say, we find monasteries coeval with the dawn of British Christianity, and one is tempted to believe that it would not be an extravagance to assert that all the Early Churches of Britain were monastic. It would take up too much time and space to attempt to establish this theory in the present paper. The circumstances of the country and period, the relations of the first Christian foundations with Bardo-Druidism, favour this view. In connection with this point the following extract from the First Book of the Laws of Hwyl Dda (Howel the Good), is very significant.

Whoever shall do any wrong to the *Mother Church* let him pay fourteen pounds; half of it to the *Abbot*, if he be a professor of divinity, and the other half between the priest and the cloister. . . . . Whoever shall do any injury to another church let him pay seven pounds; half of which goes to the priest and the other to the curate.\*

I have introduced the italics in the above extract. It would

---

\* Probert's "Ancient Laws of Cambria," Edition of 1823.

seem that in the tenth century, when these laws of Howel were promulgated, the Churches regarded as the "mother," or primeval Churches, were all monastic, as the allocation of the fine to the "Abbot" and the "Cloister" shows. If we are to believe Giraldus, in the days of Dewi (St. David), monasteries were built everywhere; and John of Teignmouth represents Padarn (Paternus), as having founded monasteries all throughout Ceretica.

Here I attempt to give a tabular list of the ancient British Monasteries of which record remains. For greater clearness I prefix the names of the modern Counties in which they were situate:—

County.	Title of Monastery.	Founder.	Date of Foundation.
Anglesey	Caer Gybi	Cybi	Sixth Century
"	Cor Seiriol	Einion	"
Cardigan	Llanbadarn Vaur	St. Padarn	Fifth "do."
Caermarthen	Ty Gwyn ar Dav	Pawl Hên	"
Caernarvon	Bangor Deiniol	Deiniol	Sixth "do."
"	Enlli (Bardsey)	Cadvau	"
Flint	Bangor Iscoed	Dunawd	"
"	Clynnog Vaur	St. Beino	Early Seventh do.
"	Llanelwy	St. Kentigern	Sixth "do."
Glamorgan	Bangor Deilo	St. Teilo	Fifth "do."
"	Bangor Iltyd	St. Germanus	"
"	Cor Eurgain	Uncertain	Uncertain
"	Cor Cenydd	Cenydd	Sixth Century
"	Llancarvan	Meirig	Fifth "do."
"	Llanederyn	Edeyrn	"
"	Llangenys	Cyngar	"
"	Llangyvelach	St. David	"
Hereford	Leominster	St. David	"
"	Merthyr Clydawg	Uncertain	Sixth "do."
Monmouth	Caerleon	St. Dubritius	Fifth "do."
"	Caerwent	Tathan	Sixth "do."
"	Heullan	St. Dubritius	Fifth "do."
"	Llandewi (Llanthony)	St. David	"
"	Mochros	St. Dubritius	"
Montgomery	Trallwng	Llewellyn ap Bleiddyd	Sixth "do."
Pembroke	Rhos (Menevia)	Uncertain	Fifth "do."
Radnor	Llones	Maelog	Sixth "do."
Somerset	Bangor Wydrin	Uncertain	Uncertain
Wilts	Cor Emrys	Emrys, or Ambri	Uncertain

This list is by no means exhaustive. I could without any great stress on historical probability have extended it. For instance, the seven sons of Cynwain rescued from drowning by St. Teilo, and educated by him, led a monastic life. Their curious legend in the Book of Llandaf mentions that the stone upon which they received their food was called *Llech Meneich*, "the Monk's Stone." The place where they were educated is now called after them Llanddowror (ten miles south-west of Caermar-

then), from *Llandyfrgwyd*, "the Church of the Water Men." Was there, then, a monastery at Llanddowror?\* Afterwards they removed to Mathru, where they got the title of the Seven Saints of Mathru, and finally to Cenarth Mawr. Were there monasteries in these places also? I could credibly argue that there were, but I have preferred to insert those only in my list which have been accepted by undoubted authorities. Neither have I included in the list cells, or hermitages, such as Llan Cyngulan, Llan Arbothdu, Llan Conuur, and Llan Pencreig, all near Landaff and Cardiff; or Bassaleg and Tintern, in Monmouthshire. My authorities have been principally the "Cambrian Biography," "Liber Landavensis," "Lives of the Cambro-British Saints," "Bonedd y Saint," Rees's "Welsh Saints." &c., with such assistance as can be derived in confirmation from bardic allusions, chronicles, and well-known histories. As Welsh chronology is puzzling, to say the least, I have kept on the safe side by fixing the century of the foundation of each monastery only. I have included Clynnog Vawr in the list, because its founder, St. Beino, was more of a sixth century saint than one belonging to the seventh. Clynnog Vawr was founded about 616 A.D.

I have marked Cor Eurgain, Bangor Wydrin, and Cor Emrys as "uncertain," for both the time of foundation, and the names of the founders are only given in a hazy manner in improbable legends, unsupported by any grave testimony of history, and in some points even contrary to well-grounded historical evidence. Take Cor Eurgain, for example. Welsh chroniclers attribute its foundation to Eurgain,† daughter of Caradog ap Brân ab Llyr, the famous Caraetacaeus. I could not accept this as a historical statement. There is not a glimpse of historical fact, either, in the accounts of the origin of Bangor Wydrin, the monastery in Inys Wydrin, *the glassy isle*, known afterwards to

\* \* Ablatis filiis septem patri funesto, vir magnae pietatis nutritivit eos, et ad studium literarum misit, quos in podo suo Llantelieu dimisit, ut aliis quidem sumpto loco nomine Llandyfrgwyd, eo quod nullo alio victu vivebant (ob religiosam suam vitam) nisi aquatibus piscibus, et ad numero eorum sufficientiam VII. quotidie, super saxum unum, sumpto sibi nomine, id est *Lech meneich* in Taf flumine, a Deo sibi missis. Et iterum ideo vocati sunt Dufuyr gwyr, eo quod inventi sunt in aqua, et per aquam evasi, et de aquaticis piscibus procurati: Dufuyr gwyr, id est Britannico sermone, aquatici viri. . . . Et postquam dies et tempore religiose diu in loco illo duxerunt, et alio multo tempore cum beato Dubricio conversati sunt, misit eos ad alium locum suum qui vocatur Mathru in Pepitiauc; et ibi vocati sunt *seith saint* Mathru. Et postquam ibi per aliud spatium morati sunt; inde venerunt ad Cenaud Maur. . . . —"Liber Landavensis," pp. 121, 122.

† Some chroniclers allege that Cor Eurgain was the original Bangor Iltyd, on account of the Triadic statement that *Caer Worgan* was the site of this monastery. Others place Cor Eurgain near Llan Ilid, in another part of Glamorganshire.

deathless fame as Glastonbury. No doubt both these monasteries were early foundations, and Bangor Wydrin must have early evoked high veneration, seeing how the Welsh traditions have fixed upon it as the last resting-place of that *flos regum Arthurus*, and his queen, Gwenhwyvar, with how much reason it is not easy to say. Cor Emrys (Ambresbury) was also an early foundation, but its origin is lost in fable, which the classical Geoffrey of Monmouth has almost elevated into mythology.

I have given to St. Germanus the credit of having founded Llantwit Major, for its fame as a monastery and college dates from his time. A previous foundation may have existed—probably did exist on the spot—but history is silent in regard to it. To Abbot Dunawd I have ascribed Bangor Iscoed for similar reasons. It certainly existed before his time, and it is probable that Pelagius issued from its walls. The mention of his name suggests the idea that Bardo-Druidic tenets were mingled with the theology of the Early British Church before the days of St. Germanus. The mission of the latter was to extirpate them, which he effectually did for a time. To raise up an educated body of clergy as safeguards against heresy was his motive in founding Bangor Iltyd. He seems to have re-converted Britain, and it will be noticed, from the list of monasteries I have given, that nearly all the famous monasteries of Wales date from, or after, his time. He was the instrument for infusing a new life into the British Church, and the vivifying current of that life was plainly monastic.

I draw two conclusions from the foregoing:—I. Before the Saxon invasion there were monasteries in Britain, as shown by the existence of Bangor Wydrin, Cor Emrys, and Cor Eurgain. II. The monastic life in Britain was fuller, and more vigorous after the mission of St. Germanus than before. To that mission we owe all the great saints of Wales.

Let us now take another aspect of this question suggested by our catalogue of monasteries. Thirteen counties are given there, and taking them *en bloc*, it will be seen that even this incomplete list still leaves an average of over two monasteries to each county. To the counties of England generally, I can ascribe no monasteries in British times. We have abundant reason to infer that they existed; but they were extirpated by the Saxons. Still, there is a goodly show of monasteries even in the fragments history has thrown down to us. There were cells and hermitages besides, and monasteries such as those founded by St. David\* and others, of which no clear history has been delivered to us.

---

\* "Per cuncta igitur tocius patrie loca monasteria construxere fratres." . .  
Vita Sancti David in "Lives of the Cambro-British Saints."

And these monasteries of which we have record were not small. A Triad, one of the series of "memorial, record, and knowledge," known as the Historical Triads, has preserved to our times the following tradition :—

The three chief perpetual choirs of the Isle of Britain ; the choir of Llan Iltyd Vawr in Caer Worgan, Cor Emrys in Caer Caradawg ; and Bangor Wydrin in the Isle of Avalon : and in each of these three Bangors were two thousand four hundred saints, that is one hundred were engaged in rotation every hour, both day and night, in celebrating the praise and service of God without rest or intermission. (Triad 84.)

Henllan, Mochros, and Caerleon, must have been largely peopled, for the numerous students of Dubritius were in these places, as well as the monks. Enlli, "the Rome of Britain," "the Land of Indulgences, Absolution and Pardon, the Road to Heaven, the Gate of Paradise," as the Welsh Bards have apostrophised it, must have swarmed with monks from all parts of the mainland, who repaired to end their days on Bardsey Island. In a rhyme of mediæval times, written by Hywel ab Davydd ab Jeuan ab Rhys, of Aberdare, we read :—

“ Twenty thousand saints of yore  
Came to lie on Bardseyo’s shore.”

Llanedeyrn had three hundred members, Llanbadarn, one hundred and twenty, Llanelwy nine hundred and sixty, and these remarkable numbers claim credence, when we remember that Bangor Iscoed, on the testimony of two credible and independent authorities,\* enclosed two thousand one hundred monks.

With respect to convents of women, so little is said in the chronicles, that many have concluded no such institutions existed in the Early British Church. I have found, however, that Wales abounded in holy women leading the recluse life such as St. Gladys, Dwywe, Cein Wyryv and Dwynwen in the fifth and sixth centuries ; and probably, a passage in the life of Gwenfrewi (Saint Winifrede) points to the first regular establishment of the conventional life for women.†

\* Bede, Hist. Eccles: lib. ii. cap. 2, and the "Myvyrian Archaiology," vol. ii., p. 364.

† "In diebus illis, totius Brittannie sancti ad sinodum Wenefredi concionabantur; ad quam alius sanctis, etiam beata Wenefreda ascendit; ibidemque omnibus ritu sinodali reliquose institutis, videlicet, ut sancti qui antea disparati singillatim viveant, nullam habentes regulam nisi voluntatem, postea gregatim convenienter in locis ad hoc congruis, et eorum conversationum sub prioribus proiectis sibi prefectis emendarent. Unde contigit beatam Wenefredam undecim virginibus esse pre-electam, ut vite, et sancte conversationis exemplum ab ea exciperent." In the fifth century, however, St. Gladwys had as many as seven inmates of her convent. "Lives of the

I think no one can contemplate the extraordinary development of monasticism in Britain in early days without astonishment. Her overflowing monasteries represented so many great sacrifices, made by a poor, harassed and scattered people. Let us, for a moment, glance at the relations by which the monks were made active partakers in the life of the nation as a whole; by which they were bound to the people and the people to them. The land was less thickly populated than it is at present, hence, the monks must have represented no mean proportion of the total population. It required a host of benefactors to bestow lands upon these monasteries; and that so many could be found in that rude time of war and rapine, to make these grants, shows the estimation in which monastic life was held. Through the monastic colleges and schools passed the princes, nobles, bishops, ecclesiastics, bards, and all who had any pretension to learning in the land. By ties of kindred alone, the monks of each monastery must have been connected with half the population of the surrounding district. Pilgrims from all parts crowded to the monastery; there the weak sought refuge; the wicked, forgiveness, the holy, fresh consolation; the poor, alms, the sick an hospital; the wayfarer an asylum. The early British Church was certainly monastic\* in its character; this is as certain as that the character of Anglicanism has been from the first anti-monastic.

It would take too long, and involve too many intricate points of discussion, to attempt here to describe the lives led by these monks. I will give a general and brief account of their discipline, distinctly prefacing that the remarks I make upon this head are in no sense intended to be exhaustive.

There was no legislation apparently, that is no fixed code, such as the Benedictine Rule, for regulating the lives and observance of the British monks. The shortest method by which to obtain a knowledge of how they lived, would be to read in connection with the lives of the British Saints, the life of St. Anthony by St. Athanasius. Manual labour was a prominent feature of their discipline. I have extracted the following two passages for the purpose of showing the similarity that existed between the monks

"Cambro-British Saints," *Vita Sancte Winifrede, per Elerium Britanum Monachum Anno 660 aut Robertum Salopiensem anno 1190.* Ex. Cott. Lib. Brit. Mus. Claudius A.V. These "Lives" are collections from ancient Welsh and Latin MSS. in the British Museum and elsewhere, published for the Welsh MSS. Society at Llandovery in 1853. Many portions are copies of very early MSS. Some authorities allege that these "lives" have not been too carefully edited, but the errors yet pointed out have been merely verbal. The Latin text, I have copied literally.

\* The character of the Church in Ireland in early times was also monastic. See "Life of Saint Patrick," by Father Morris, p. 123, and also Dr. Todd's "St. Patrick," p. 87.

of old Wales and those of the Thebaid. If the reader will compare the two passages in the note below\*, he cannot fail to have something more than a suspicion that the British monks copied St. Anthony :—“ He who doth not labour should not eat,” was taken literally as a Divine Command, and from an expression applied to “ labour ” in the “ Life of St. David,” it would seem that his monks regarded labour as something divine. At all events, St. David’s monks built their houses and churches, made their own clothes, tilled their fields, refused all possessions, rejected the gifts of the unjust ; nay, the rule of labour went so far as to prohibit the use of oxen in ploughing. The monks put on the yoke themselves, and drew the plough ; so that the old chronicler in the “ Lives ” quaintly says, speaking of them, “ and every one is an ox to himself.” In the Life of St. Iltyd, it is related that when his wife, whom he left behind when he entered Llantwit Major, came some years afterwards to steal a look at him over the enclosure—or stone boundary wall of the monastery —his face was so meagre from fasting, and so begrimed with his work, that she was horrified, and for some time could scarcely recognize in the visage before her the once comely and proud features of the noble Knight Iltyd.

But labour occupied only a part of the day, chiefly, I think, the forenoon. Taking for the present, St. David’s monks as the model, I will complete rapidly this short sketch. The monks rose at dawn and repaired to the church for prayer, genuflection and the “ appointed oblation of the Lord’s Body.” Then they went to field labour, and returning after its performance, spent the afternoon in reading, writing, instruction and prayer. At the sound of the bell they rose, leaving their work at once and repaired to the church, where the psalms were sung and prayer went on until the stars came out. This was followed by a supper of bread, with herbs seasoned with salt, and a light drink. The sick and the aged were regaled on better fare. After grace, again at the ringing of the bell, they repaired to the church where three hours were spent in “ watchings, prayers and genuflections ; and while they pray in the church no one dare to gape,

---

\* “ Laborabat itaque manibus suis; audierat nempe: *Qui otiosus fuerit ne manducet*, atque hinc partim panem sibi emebat, partim egenis largiebatur.” Migne’s Patrologia Tom. xvi. Op. omn. S. Athanasii, p. 356. “ Idem etenim manuum suarum operibus par duxit vitam transigere, metuens alterius labores otiose comedere, sperens aporiamine presentis sudoris, se transmigraturum ad gloriam ‘ perpetue quietis,’ secundum illud Psalmographi, ‘ Labores manuum tuarum qui manducab’ ” et cetera. Et Apostolus “ Unusquisque vestrum manibus suis operando laboret ut habeat unde tribuat necessitatem pacientibus” et rursum “ Nullus ex vobis panem ociosum comedat, et qui non laborat, nec manducet.” Lives of the Cambro-British Saints ; “ Vita Sancti Cadoci,” pag. 35.

or sneeze, or spit." Saturday night seems to have been spent altogether in watching in the church.

The clothing of these monks, that is their habit, was chiefly made of hair cloth and skins. The monks of Bardsey are reported to have worn black cowls. The Welsh traditions record that St. Tydecho wore a *pais rawn*—that is hair coat. I could give several references as to the "shaggy garments" of the monks of this period, but perhaps what I have said on this point will be sufficient.

The reception of a novice was a trying time for the aspirant, young or old. He was kept waiting before the doors of the monastery ten days, "tried with reproachful language," and subsequently on his admission had to labour hard for a long time, and have "his mind broken with vexatious circumstances.\* He had to give all his substance away before entering the monastery, which received not a penny from him, but he entered as though "escaped naked from a shipwreck."†

The British tonsure differed from the Roman tonsure; for, instead of leaving a circle of hair, the Britons shaved a segment of a circle in front of a line drawn over the top of the head from ear to ear. This has been called, on no warrant whatever, the tonsure of Simon Magus. The error seems to have arisen from a confusion between the word "magi," and the appellative of the arch-simoniae "Magus." Some "magi" among the Druids are conjectured to have been tonsured. I doubt this. The Druid when performing certain functions—the judicial, for example—wore a wreath of oak leaves encircling the temples, and behind it a golden crescent-shaped tiara, with clips, like those of a pair of spectacles, only shaped differently, for catching behind his ears and thus supporting his tiara. The over-thick hair of an unkempt Druid may have had sometimes to be removed to make "a fit"; but it is quite incorrect to say there was any ceremony of tonsure. As the monastic tonsure was certainly connected with the "crown of life," and the "crown of thorns," and therefore symbolised a crown, the early British monks in their intense nationality may have thought it not only harmless, but laudable, to adhere to

\* Vita Sancti David in Lives of the Cambro-British Saints.

† The only account I have read of a clothing or profession is the following, describing in a few words the clothing or profession of St. Iltyd by the Bishop of Llandaff, St. Dubritius:—

"Talibus visis, et sibi complacitis, adivit famulus Dei, beatissimus Iltutus Dubricium Landavensis episcopum, qui sibi penitentiam de transactis delictis injunxit, barbam rasit, comam totondit, coronam benedixit. Postremo, clericali habitu suscepto, secundum angelicum preceptum, in sompno revelatum, coronatus, rediit ad eundem locum." Vita Sancti Iltuti, pag. 163 (Cambro-British Saints).

that form of tonsure which in some way corresponded with the form of the national crown as represented in the Druidical tiara.

With one or two words on the constructions used as churches and monastic buildings, I will leave the question of British monasteries, which I feel only too conscious has been inadequately treated. Whoever would realise aright what a British monastic church was like, must banish from his mind all pre-conceived notions of a glorious abbey church. With such a building we are accustomed to evolve mental images of lofty towers, high gilded vaults, long stately aisles, soaring arches, tiled floors, shrines blazing with golden lamps, and hung with diamonds, pearls, and amethysts, marble altars inlaid with gold, lofty candelabra, stained-glass storied windows—in a word, the pomp of heaven itself; but these, all these, were for another age and another race; the simple, primitive Celt knew nothing of them. His church vessels and vestments, his quaint hand-bells, to which he attached extraordinary importance, were all he had of ornamental or magnificent. His church was either of wattled walls (*frondibus contexta*), or plain wood, thatched with rushes. The monastery consisted of a great number of huts of similar construction, surrounding the church, with a large granary, a cemetery on an adjoining mound, with its rude uncarved pillar-stones; the whole enclosed by a wall built, often without mortar, of huge rough stones in a truly cyclopean style. Some few stone chapels there were like those built by St. David and St. Iltyd, and generally wherever the Goidele or Gaelic element predominated over the Brythonic or British: but in order to understand what these were like in their primitive uncouthness—more resembling mausoleums than temples—a visit should be paid to some of the remote islands lying off the Irish coast, such as Inis Scattery, where one of these early Celtic stone chapels can still be seen.

There are two salient characteristics of the British Church—Saints and Miracles—which it is enough only to mention to exhibit their blank absence from Anglicanism. No history of the British Church can be written with any pretence to completeness that would pass over her wonder-working Saints who exorcised demons, caused holy wells to flow, healed the sick, and raised the dead to life.

The language of the Liturgy may appear to be a small question, but is nevertheless important. The ideal of the Anglican Church is a vernacular Liturgy; that of the British Church was in Latin. Taliesin, the great Cymric bard of the sixth century, intersperses fragments of the liturgy in his Welsh compositions, and all his quotations are in the Latin tongue. The Britons

gave a Latin "missa" to some of the Irish congregations of saints, and received one themselves from St. Germanus.

Invocation of saints is declared by the Anglican Church to be a "fond thing vainly invented." The vain invention found a place in the early British Church, and had a strong hold upon the popular imagination, as may be seen by the following extracts from bardic compositions of the sixth century. Taliesin writes:—

"Through the intercession of saints,  
And the comprehensive sense of books,  
May the Eternal God grant to me  
The joyous feast of the region of light."

*Myvyrian Archaiology, vol. 1, p. 77.*

In another place the same bard alludes to St. Cynllo, and says "his prayer will not be in vain." Golyddan, the bard of Cadwallon ap Cadvan, who flourished A.D. 560-630, encourages his compatriots to invoke the saints:—

"Let them commit their cause to God and Dewi,  
Through the intercession of Dewi and the saints of Prydyn."  
*Mvy. Arch., vol. 1, p. 157.*

Devotion to Our Lady—*Arglwyddes Veir*\*—was practised in the British Church. A "Lent of Mary" was one of the marked penitential seasons of the ancient Cymry, and with pardonable pride but questionable history they loved to trace the pedigrees of their more distinguished saints and princes from a cousin of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Aneurin, the rival and contemporary of Taliesin, in his "Odes of the Months," celebrates September by reference to her nativity thus:—

"A royal maid is born,  
Who has brought us from our grievous bondage."

That her festivals were of time-honoured establishment in the tenth century may be seen by reference to the Welsh laws, where they are fixed as well-known and long established term days for the performance of various public duties. As early as the fifth century St. Gwynllw dedicated his oratory at Newport, Monmouthshire, to Our Lady. These dedications were made at all times, that is, of churches to particular patrons, but not before the eighth century was it common in Wales to call the church by any other name than that of the founder, or some local landmark. Thus Llandaff was dedicated to St. Peter in the days of St. Germanus, but was never called Lianpedyr. I merely refer to this peculiarity, because the absence of saints' names from the

\* Literally "The Lady Mary"; so she was entitled in the very early times in Wales.

titles of early churches has sometimes been adduced as a proof that the early Welsh did not invoke the prayers and assistance of the saints.

Devotion to the Relics of Saints was carried to an extraordinary degree in the early British Church. When St. Teilo died three churches quarrelled as to which should possess his remains; St. Oudoceus and his clergy were attacked on their way to St. David's by robbers on account of the value and great number of the reliquaries which they bore. All have read of St. Germanus and his bearing away to Gaul, dust from the tomb of St. Alban. St. David's handbell, his cope and his "golden topped crozier," were held in the highest veneration.\*

The practice of praying for the souls of the Departed was prevalent in the Early British Church. It was common, popular, and universal.

"Enaid Owain ab Urien,  
*Gobwylid ei Ren ei raid:*  
 Rheged udd ei cudd tom las,  
 Nid oedd fas ei gywyddaid."—*Taliesin.*

"The soul of Owain, the son of Urien,  
*May its Lord compassionate its necessity;*  
 The chief of Rheged that is hidden by the green mound.  
 Not low was his panegyric."

In the *Archæologia Cambrensis*, 1849, will be found a description of a very old monument in the Church of Towyn, Merionethshire. The stone was described at a meeting of the Cambrian Archæological Association by Mr. Westwood. The characters in which the inscriptions on this stone are engraved correspond with those of Irish MSS. of the seventh century. I can only find space for one of these inscriptions, but it is a living proof, so to speak, of the antiquity of the custom of praying for the dead in Wales.

#### INSCRIPTION.

✠ TENGRCIMALTEDGUADGAN MOLT CLODE  
 TUER TRICET NITANAM.

\* This may be an item of interest to ecclesiologists:—The emblems of the Patron Saint of Wales are a fish, a honeycomb, and a stag. The fish is the emblem of his temperate life—St. David was a total abstainer—the honeycomb of his wisdom, and the stag of his power over the old serpent. Fuller explanation may be found on reference to the "Lives of the Cambro-British Saints" Vita Sancti David, p. 118. In a transcript of an old Triadic commentary, I have seen this curious invocation of St. David—St. David, the waterman, pray for us! This title was given him because he drank no wine, or other intoxicant.

Ab Ithel has put this in Modern Welsh as follows :—

TAN GRUG CYVAL TEDD GADVAN  
MARTH MOLL CLOD Y DDAEAR,  
TRIGED NID ANAV.

The English translation is :—

“ Beneath a similar mound is extended Cadvan \*—sad that it should enclose the praise of the earth.

*May he rest without blemish! ”*

Purgatory was openly preached by St. Cadoc, and Llywarch Hênen, who lived in the sixth century, thus refers to it :—

“ Berwyd brâd anvad ober :

*Byddant dolur pan burer. . .*”

“ Heroic Elegies,” *Yr Gog, Yn Aber Cuawg.*

“ Treachery ferments every evil deed,

*That will be torture when the time of purifying comes,* . . &c.

The hardiest Anglican will not be bold enough to aver that devotion to Our Lady, to saints and to their relics, habitual prayer for the Dead or the Doctrine of Purgatory, are characteristics of his Church.†

The Mass in early Christian Britain was accounted a sacrifice, and is referred to in the “Lives of the Cambro-British Saints,” as the Pure Oblation, the Divine Sacrifice. The history of Anglicanism for two hundred and fifty years at least is a history of sacrilegious denial and obliteration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Auricular Confession, like the observance of Fasting, disappeared as Anglicanism became the creed of England. On both these points the Church of England is poles asunder from the belief and practice of the early British Church. There is no need to cite instances of the severe fast practised by British Christians; for them fasting, as St. Cadoc tritely says, was one of the “three physicians of the soul”; prayer and almsdeeds the other two. In regard to Confession, St. Gwynllyw says to his son St. Cadoc, “Ego te ad me accercivi quatinus in extremo vite meam confessionem audias.” St. Teilo was the appointed confessor of King Gerennius of Cornwall, as was St. Cadoc of King Maelgwn.

---

\* Cadvan was the son of Eneas of Llydaw, that is Laetavia or Armorica. He came to Britain in the beginning of the sixth century.

† Some may feel surprised that I omitted referring to Geoffrey of Monmouth’s fable of Arthur’s banner of the Blessed Virgin at the Battle of Badon. An earlier authority, the “Annales Cambriae,” under 516 A.D., gives the historic account thus: “Bellum Badonis, in quo Arthur portavit crucem Domini nostri Jesu Christi tribus diebus et tribus noctibus in humeros suos, et Britones victores fuerunt.”

What has become of the Holy Chrism in Anglicanism? From Gildas, John of Teignmouth, and the Life of St. Padarn we learn that it was used in the administration of Holy Orders and Confirmation in the British Church.

What Anglican Bishop has ever excommunicated King, Lord Protector—or indeed any Lord? The Book of Llandaff shows what British Bishops did in this way.

And what has become of the Sign of the Cross in Anglican usage; a marked, habitual practice of British Catholics?

So undeniably deeply engraved on the face of Early Church History in Britain are these and similar tokens of Catholicity that Woodward exclaims in his "History of Wales" speaking of the Early British Church, that it was "thoroughly indoctrinated with some of the most objectionable superstitions which have ever been identified with the Church of Rome." Such a Church could certainly not be identical with the Anglican.

Pope St. Gregory divided the Bishops of the British Church into three categories, (1) the unlearned, (2) the weak, (3) the perverse.\* He committed them all to the care of St. Augustine ordering him to instruct the first, persuade the second, and correct the third by authority. The Pope could not have looked upon these Bishops as belonging to another Church than the Roman; if he did, he would certainly not have countenanced them at all. Neither did St. Augustine regard them as of a different Church, otherwise he would not have bracketed them with those of France, and invited them to become his coadjutors. The story of what followed is too well-known to be repeated here. Two synods were held, not to settle matters of faith, but to correct abuses. The abuses were all on the side of the Britons, smarting and galled by their terrible defeats; the correction was all on the part of St. Augustine, and so the British Bishops mutinied.

If the revolt of the British Bishops was not a mutiny, but the steadfast assertion of the principle of independence of the Apostolic See, we ought to find somewhere in their annals before the coming of St. Augustine, some trace at least of the previous assertion of this principle. We ought to find it in the annals of the Universal Church; for if Britain had an independent Church, that would simply be treated as a heresy, and duly denounced from Rome. But there are no such traces in any history of these times. What then were the relations of the Roman and British Churches before the coming of St. Augustine? What were these relations after his coming and before Wales submitted to Canterbury?

---

\* Bede: Hist. Eccles. lib. I. Cap. XXVII.

As well as direct submission to Papal authority, there are signs by which you can tell a Roman Catholic in his veneration for the Pope, for the Chair of Peter, for the Tombs of SS. Peter and Paul and even for the City of Rome itself. This position, I think, will be recognised at once, as being the attitude of a sincere Roman Catholic; and I propose now to show from the annals of Early Britain, that submission and veneration marked the early relations of British Christians to Rome, and continued to mark them, down to the Mutiny at St. Augustine's Oak. And I further propose to show that submission and veneration marked the attitude of Welsh Catholics to Rome after the Mutiny, and before these Catholics thought of admitting the jurisdiction of Canterbury. Indeed, it becomes a question whether the British Bishops ever mutinied against Rome at all—a question that must have forced itself on the authors of the forgery respecting Abbot Dunawd in the seventeenth century. It is obvious no Papal authority in the shape of a document was shown to the British Bishops at the synods. As archiepiscopal jurisdiction conveyed the idea of a province, it was no unusual thing in those days, to resist such an authority, on the part of any people who refused to admit that they were conquered. And we know the Britons had no mind to surrender wild Wallia to the Saxons. However this may be, let us now see what answer the records give to the questions I have put above.

The enumeration of the various references to Rome in British Chronicles will certainly be tedious, but I can hit upon no better plan than to give a few of the principal, in as short form as possible, leaving the reader to judge whether they establish the submission and veneration I conceive to be characteristic of Roman Catholics in regard to the Holy See and to Rome.

1. One of the earliest British traditions is that a certain Brân the Blessed became a Christian at Rome, and first brought the faith from Rome here. This is the testimony of the oldest and most genuine of all British traditions—the Triads. The Bards confirm it and have another tradition that he brought from Rome the science of writing Roll and Plagawd. The reference is too long to quote, see “*Barddas*” vol. i, p. 36.

2. In the same triad is mentioned Lleirwg (Lucius) as the second of the blessed princes. The story of Lucius and his relations with Pope Eleutherius, given by Venerable Bede, the Liber Pontificalis, and a host of other authorities is well known. I will merely say that all these authorities are confirmed by the independent stream of Welsh tradition.

3. Three British bishops went to the Council of Arles and subscribed its decrees, which were confirmed by the Pope.

4. St. Athanasius and Sulpicius Severus establish the presence

of British bishops at the council of Sardica. They signed the decrees of that council, which in its seventh chapter establishes appeals to the Roman Pontiff to settle questions *de episcopis accusatis*.

5. British Bishops were present at the Councils of Troyes in 429 A.D., when they besought that council to assist them in overthrowing Pelagianism. Other councils are mentioned; I give those only about which certainty exists.

6. The Britons received St. Germanus and his teaching. He trained or met with nearly all their greatest saints, and was an undoubted Roman Catholic. St. Prosper of Aquitaine in two of his works expressly attributes to Pope Celestine the mission of St. Germanus.

7. St. David presided over the Synod of Victory at Caerleon about A.D. 529. The decrees of that synod were confirmed at Rome in conjunction with those of the national synod of Brevi. "Ex his igitur duabus synodis, omnes nostre patrie ecclesie modum et regulam Romana auctoritate acceperunt." . . . (Vita Sancti David p. 139.)

8. St. Brynach visited Rome and was allowed to preach there.—("Lives of the Cambro-British Saints," Vita Sancti Bernaci p. 1.)

9. "I have for the Love of God gone thrice to Jerusalem and seven times to Rome."—St. Cadoc. (Vita Sancti Cadoci, p. 56)

10. St. Cadoc received a consecrated bell from the Pope for administering oaths. The title given to the Pope in this narration is "Summus apostolice sedis Pontifex."—(Vita Sancti Cadoci p. 59.)

11. St. David visited Rome in fulfilment of a vow. "Alio quoque tempore cum inextinguibile desiderium ad Sanctorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum reliquias visitandas haberet . . . . perfecta saluturi vota, ad monasterii claustra revertens, &c., &c."—(Vita Sancti David p. 132.)

12. St. Beino made a similar pilgrimage to Rome. (Vita Sancti Wenfrede, p. 202.)

13. Bardsey Island was called the "Rome of Britain" on account of, amongst other things, "its sanctity and dignity."—(Liber Landavensis, p. 3.)

14. Lantwit Major. "In this monastery they had, out of reverence, Bishops to sit in the Chair of St. Peter when they assembled together." (Liber Landavensis Vita Sancti Samsoni. Latin original at p. 18.)

15. St. Sampson attended a Council held at Paris, of Prelates in communion with Rome. He signed the decrees as stated by Albert le Grand in the following manner, "Ego Samso, peccutor (sic) adscripsi."

16. The Church of Llandaff was founded in honour of St. Peter the Apostle.—(Liber Landavensis, p. 66.)

17. The altar of St. Peter was held in great reverence at Llandaff, and grants to the Church in the very earliest times are many of them thus worded, "To God, to St. Peter, to Saint Dubricius, &c."—(Liber Landavensis.)

18. The privileges of St. Teilo and his Church of Llandaff were confirmed by apostolical authority. (Lib. Landavensis, p. 113.) In the Latin the words "apostolical authority" are used, but in a Welsh document following the Latin, the word "Popes" occurs instead. This is the entry in Welsh to which I refer, and which I quote in its ancient orthography. There is a modernised form added as a note in the Book of Llandaff:

Lymma a cymreith ha bryeint eccluys Telian o Lanntaf a rodes  
breenhined hinn ha thouyssogion cymry yn trycyguydaul dy eccluys  
Teliau, hac dir escip oll gueti ef, amcydarnedig o awdurdant papen  
rufein.

The English translation of this is :

This is the law and privilege of the church of Teilo, of Llandaff, which those Kings and Princes of Wales granted to the church of Teilo, and to all its Bishops after him for ever, and was confirmed by the Popes of Rome. (Liber Landavensis, p. 113.)

It is to be noted that in the older Latin document the words used, as I have said above, are "apostolical authority," for which the "Popes of Rome" stand in the Welsh document, which as it appears to me, although an ancient text, is certainly later than the Latin. There is a note added to this section by a fifteenth century scribe, but headed "Nota," and quite separate from the context, setting forth that the *magna excommunicationis sententia* obtained by St. Teilo in *curia Romana contra invasores*, &c., was pronounced on his day in 1410 A.D. against certain persons. Anybody who takes the trouble to compare the language of the older Latin, the less modern Welsh, and the comparatively modern "Nota," cannot fail to realise the great antiquity of the sources from which the Book of Llandaff has been in part transcribed and in part compiled.

19. "The Church of Rome has dignity above all the churches of the Catholic faith." . . . . Romana ecclesia exedit dignitatem omnium ecclesiarum catholicæ fidei." . . . . (Liber Landavensis, pag. 125. Vita Sancti Oudocei.)

20. St Oudoceus went to Rome and received there the privilege of his predecessors, St. Dubritius and St. Teilo, with the "apostolical dignity."

"Sanctus Oudoceus post tempus suæ maturitatis, visitatis ab eo liminibus Sancti Petri cum accepto sibi privilegio Sanctorum

Dubricii et Teliaui, apostolica dignitate, et confirmato in perpetuo posteris suis &c. (*Liber Landavensis* p. 127).

21. St. Kentigern (*Cyndeyrn*) applied to Rome on the matter of his consecration as related by Nennius.

I could easily cite many more instances of the submission and veneration for the Holy Apostolic See of Rome, manifested by the children of the Early British Church, but I have given enough—perhaps more than enough for the patience of readers—to exhibit the secular obedience of those primitive Christians to the Roman See before the arrival of St. Augustine. As to the authority to be attached to two of the sources of information from which I have quoted, the strongest objection urged is that they are at best, eleventh and twelfth century transcripts of alleged older MSS., which have disappeared altogether. The two sources to which I refer are the "Lives of the Cambro-British Saints" and the *Liber Landavensis*. Unfortunately for the objectors, the objection alluded to, has been chiefly made by those who have never once laid eyes on these records. On the other hand their authority has been admitted by those who have perused them; and especially by those whose skill in testing the value of ancient MSS. has been generally acknowledged. To enter here upon the arguments drawn from archaic forms of expression, topographical boundaries, remarkable entries and equally remarkable omissions, would carry us too far, although these and other marks would conclusively prove the antiquity and credibility of these records. I have, as may have been noticed, supported the statements I quoted in many places, by apposite quotations from other sources. The same antiquity and the same authority belong to both compilations, and the Lives of the Saints given in the *Liber Landavensis* are similar in tone and idea to those in the other work just mentioned; but from its more general character, the *Liber Landavensis* has attracted greater attention. Its authority has been admitted by the following historians among others, Godwin, Ussher, Spelman, Dugdale, Cressy, Wharton, Lhuyd, Nicholson, Collier, Willis, Nicholls, Tanner, and Pughe the Welsh lexicographer. I will not enter either on the question of editing, as it is a matter which however important, will not affect in any way the general historical evidence given by these works. Older MSS. than those copied into the editions from which I have quoted, have since the days of the Welsh MSS. Society been discovered, but not as yet published. The actual record of facts, varies little if any, but the effect of the publication of a more correct text will only confirm the authority of the histories contained in these valuable works. If not out of place, I would urge here, all who can to assist the efforts of Welsh archaeologists, not only in the publication of these chronicles,

but in the bringing to light others of interest and importance in the general history of Wales.

A long span of centuries separates St. Augustine from Giraldus Cambrensis. During all this long period the Welsh Church was independent of the jurisdiction of Canterbury. The old feud of Briton against Saxon burned fiercely in those times; so fiercely that it is related in the "Brut y Tywysogion" that Owain, son of Hywel, burned Llantwit Major and Llancarvan Monasteries, for admitting Saxons as students. This occurred A.D. 959. It cannot fail, therefore, to be of interest to take a passing glance at the relations of the Church in Wales with the Roman Pontiffs during this period.

The story of Cadwallader's pilgrimage to Rome, and death there about A.D. 682, though quite in keeping with British ideas, is contrary to the testimony of the "Annales Cambriæ" and Nennius. In A.D. 768, Elvod, Bishop of Bangor, settled the old Paschal dispute, and the Roman custom was followed.\* But that most curious and complete code of Welsh laws called "The Laws of Hywel Dda," throws all the light we require upon this period, and shows beyond cavil the Papal character of the Welsh Church. It is there enacted that any Welshman who became a traitor to his lord, and absconded, should, if he afterwards sought reconciliation, after paying the double fine of *dirwy* and *galanas*, proceed to Rome, and bring back a letter certifying his absolution by the Pope before he could obtain again his patrimony. It was laid down that the absence of a man who had gone on a pilgrimage to Rome might be lawfully supplied in the courts by his advocate. If an excommunicated person had proceeded to Rome for Papal absolution, it was enacted that no suit could be entered against such an one until one year and one day after that date upon which he set out for Rome. If a debtor denied his surety, the judge, before administering the oath with the relic, was instructed to address the debtor as follows:—"The protection of God be with thee, and the protection of the Pope of Rome, and the protection of thy lord; do not swear falsely."

We must pause here for a moment on this subject of the *Leges Wallicæ*. We have already seen the little Silurian nation approach the Holy See, and receive from the hands of the Holy Pontiff, Eleutherius, the inestimable gift of the true Christian faith. Seven centuries later we behold the larger nation of Wales soliciting from the Holy See examination and approval of her national code of laws. These inexpugnable facts cannot be explained away by any cry of Papal "encroachment." In each case the nation approached the Pontifical throne; it was not the

---

\* "Annales Cambriæ."

Pontiff who obtruded his authority on the nation. Hywel Dda, the most enlightened and beneficent of Welsh sovereigns, before codifying the laws of Wales, proceeded, with a number of his advisers, clerical and lay, to Rome, to obtain advice from the "wise men," as Caradog, of Llancarvan, puts it, as to his project. This visit took place 926 A.D., and, on his return, the king summoned to meet him at the White House upon the Tav in Dyfed—*Ty Gwyn ar Daf*—six representatives (four lay and two clerical) from every commot in Wales. There were one hundred and forty "croziers," that is, bishops, abbots, and priors, in this unique legislative assembly, which began its work by a solemn fast. This great assembly contented itself by setting out general lines of legislative procedure, and then confided the work to a committee of twelve laymen, whose secretary was the famous Blegeveyd, Chancellor of Llandaff, or, as one chronicler describes him, "Blegeveyd, Archdeacon of Llandaff, the scholar; and he was a doctor in civil law and the laws of the Church." In four years the laws of Wales were codified, altered, and, where necessary, added to, and then, with the Princes of Cambria, Lambert, Bishop of St. David's, Mordav of Bangor, Cebur of St. Asaph, and Blegeveyd, once more, Howel the Good went to Rome, to have his laws certified as containing nothing contrary to the law of the Church.

One word explains this extraordinary submission of an ancient race—proud of their antiquity, and headstrong beyond most peoples—to the head of the Church. It was *faith*; they believed in the *privilegium Petri*. The popular idea is well expressed by Welsh mediaeval bards, from two of whom, I will make brief extracts:—

“Nawdd Pedr arbenig lleithig llithion,  
Orau porthoriau, o'r porthorion.”

“The protection of Peter the peculiar one of the throne of petitions  
Of porters the best of the porters.”—*Grufydd ab Yr Ynad Coch*.

“Arbenig” may also be rendered “chief,” “superior,” “excelling,” and “supreme.”

“Archaf arch i Dduw, ar ddorau nef  
Na ddotu Pedr glöau,  
I'm lludias.”

“I will crave a boon of God, on the gates of heaven,  
That Peter place no locks,  
To hinder me.”—*Einion ab Gwalchmai*.

Thus do the twelfth and thirteenth century bards reply to the modern cry of “Papal encroachment.”

There is also a proof of Papal Supremacy in early Britain that

must not be passed over; I mean the forged speech of Abbot Dunawd. This forgery can have but one *raison d'être*; the evidence of what they sought to disprove was too strong for the forgers. Dunawd was fixed upon because of the mention made of him by Venerable Bede, and the erroneous deduction drawn therefrom that he was a learned man. I will here give the speech itself in Welsh as it is given in Wilkin's "Concilia," Tom. i. p. 26. I will then give its English translation; but I omit the Latin, as it throws no light upon the question of forgery or otherwise.

"*Responsio abbatis Bangor ad Augustinum monachum petentem subjectiōnem ecclesie Romānæ.* (Ex. MS. Cott. Cleop. E.I. fol. 56, collat. cum MS. Cott. Claudio, A. viii. fol. 76.)

Bid ipisis a diogel i chwi yn, bod in holl un ac aral yn wid ac in ynnostingedig i eglionys Duw, ac ir *Paab o Ruvain* ac i *boob kyar grissdion dwyuuol*, y garu pawb yn i radd mewni kariad *perfaith*, ac i *helpio* paub o honaunt, ar air a gweithred i vod ynn blant y Duw: ac amgenach vuyddod no-hwn niddadwen i vod ir neb, ir yddich chwi yn henwi yn *baab*, ne in daad o daade: yw gleimio ac yw ovunn ar uvyddod hwn ir iiddin ni yn varod yw roddi ac yw dalu iddo ef ac i pob krisiond yn dragwiddol. Heuid ir ydym ni dan lywodrath *esgob Caerllion ar Wysc*, yr hwn ysidd ynolygwr dan Duw arnom in y wueuthud i in gadwr ffordd ysbyrydol."

Translation of the "Reply of the Abbot of Bangor," &c.:-

"Be it known, and without doubt unto you, that we all and every one of us are obedient subjects to the Church of God, and to the *Pope of Rome*, and to *every godly christian*, to love every one in his degree in *perfect charity*; and to *help* every one of them by word and deed, to be the children of God; and other obedience than this I do not know to be due to him whom you name to be *pope* or father of fathers, to be claimed and to be demanded; and this obedience we are ready to give, and to pay to him, and to every Christian continually; besides we are under the government of the *Bishop of Caerleon-upon-Usk*; who is to oversee, under God, over us to cause us to keep the way spiritual."

I have italicized words and phrases in the Welsh original and in the English translation, which are ineradicable, internal proofs of hopeless forgery. I now set out *seriatim* all the proofs of forgery, some of which I have collected and some of which I have myself discovered.

1. The language is modern Welsh.

2. The term "*Paab o Ruvain*," (*Pope of Rome*), was most uncommon, if not unknown, in the days of Dunawd. I have given the terms usually applied to the Supreme Pontiff in Wales in the sixth century in previous extracts. But, mark, while Dunawd is made to use the words "*Pope of Rome*" as glibly as

a modern foreign correspondent, he is also made to express ignorance of the term "Pope" in the words "*whom you name to be Pope.*"

3. The use of the word *perfaith*.

4. The employment by a Briton of the sixth century of the Saxon word *helpio*.

5. The statement concerning the Bishop of Caerleon. There was no bishop at Caerleon, in Dunawd's day, neither had there been a Bishop of Caerleon for close upon one hundred years before St. Augustine's Synods.

6. The fact that the document has no other but the following slipshod history, viz., Mr. Peter Mostyn found it and gave it to Sir Henry Spelman, representing it as an ancient document copied from one still older.

7. The expression "*grissdion dwyuoel*" "*godly christian.*" This scents seventeenth century puritanical cant to the marrow. Never was such an expression used in the Ancient British Church by any writer. Here we have the genesis of the document; a goody-goody puritan, ignorant of Welsh history—probably ignorant of the Welsh tongue—composed the thing in English; it was afterwards translated into an *ancient* document written in modern Welsh!

8. Dunawd was dead several years before any interview took place between St. Augustine and the Welsh Bishops.

It is only just to the memory of Sir Henry Spelman to say, that he, in all probability was imposed upon; and possibly Mr. Mostyn also. I can conceive that one or two objections may be plausibly raised against what I may term the linguistic proofs of the forgery. The first is that Dunawd would have addressed St. Augustine in Latin, so that the Welsh document would be only a translation of the speech. I admit this, but where is the text of the Latin speech? Above all, why was the Welsh translation put forth as *ancient*? The second objection might very well lie in this way: Welsh, like Hebrew, is a comparatively stable language, hence there is little difference between its ancient and its modern forms. I have given an inscription in another part of this paper which I think disposes of this objection. But above all there are those unhappy English words in the Welsh MS. Very little admixture of English with Welsh took place before the sixteenth century: absolutely none before the days of Edward I.

What manner of man was the Abbot Dunawd? Dunawd Vawr was a powerful chieftain and warrior, son of Pabo Post Prydäin. The title of Post Prydäin, "Pillar of Britain," was given to his father for his valour in fighting against the Picts and Scots. Pabo founded Llanbabo in Anglesey, and there he

was buried.\* Dunawd is celebrated in a triad as one of the three "pillars of battle" of the Isle of Britain.

Tri post Câd Inys Prydain, Dunawd Vab Pabo, Cynvelyn Drwsgyl, ac Urien vab Cynvarç.

This famous Abbot enjoyed in his youth and manhood the reputation of understanding in common with the two other "pillars," the order and conduct of a battle better than any man that ever existed outside the trio. Such is the Triadic testimony: the Triads enshrine Dunawd among the warriors not with the divines; with Urien but not with Cadoc.

As to his character, we are fortunately possessed of an index to that in the famous and well-authenticated *Marwnad Urien Rheged*, the composition of the elegiac Bard, Llywarch Hêl, Prince of the Cumbrian Britons in the early part of the sixth century, and a man who knew Dunawd in battle only too well. Llywarch thus describes him:

"Dunawd the Knight of the warring field would fiercely rage,  
With a mind determined to make a dead corpse,  
Against the quick onset of Owain."

Dunawd, the hasty chief, would fiercely rage,  
With mind elated for the battle,  
Against the conflict of Pasgen."

And in another place in the same elegy:

—“fiercely  
Was it said in the pass of Lleŷ,  
Dunawd the son of Pabo will never fly.”

Fly, the determined old warrior did in the end, however, but his restless spirit only sought repose in variety of labour. In his old age, he raised up the magnificent but short-lived monastic glory of Bangor Iscoed. This work he carried out under the protection of Cyngen ap Cadell, Prince of Powys, and with the aid of his three sons, Deiniol, Cynwyl, and Gwarthan. Deiniol was a learned bishop, but was, for some unrecorded reason, deposed from his high office in 584 A.D. This, however, may not have prevented him from having been amongst the learned Britons who assembled to confer with the Apostle of the Anglo-Saxons. But it is against the testimony of the only historic record extant upon the important question of the year of Dunawd's death, to affirm that he was present at any conference

---

\* His tomb was opened in the reign of Charles II., and the inscription has been preserved in Rowl: *Mon. Antiq.* ed. 2, p. 151.

with St. Augustine. According to the "Annales Cambriæ," in 595 A.D. the fiery son of Pabo Post Prydain, slept with his fathers in the last sleep of all.

In conclusion, the writer of this paper has only to add his regret that the interesting story of Celtic Christianity belongs to the polemics of history. Catholics have not to reproach themselves with this. The history of the Early Church in Britain has been made a polemical question by the unhappy men who more than three hundred years ago broke the alliance between England and the centre of Christianity; an alliance which had existed for ten fair centuries, which had found England the hunting ground of conflicting savage hordes, and left her a nation, old in civilization, equipped to march forth to the conquest of the world. Nor will religious peace visit her borders until the covenant is renewed. Of that alliance we may well say in the words of Cicero, "Hæc est, inquam, societas, in qua omnia insunt, quæ putant homines expetenda, honestas, gloria, tranquillitas animi atque jucunditas; ut et, quum hæc adsint, beata vita sit, et sine his esse non possit."\*

A MEMBER OF THE CAMBRIAN ARCHÆOL. ASSOCIATION.

---

\* *De Amicitia*, cap. xxii.



## ART. IV.—THE POTATO.

*The Science of Potato Growing. Results of Experiments at Rothamsted on the Growth of Potatoes. By J. H. GILBERT, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. Reprinted from the Agricultural Students' Gazette, Cirencester.*

WHEN Pizarro and his companions, while seeking for gold among the mountains of Peru, saw the Indians cultivating the plant known at first as the *Papas Peruanorum*, they certainly did not suspect the importance of their discovery, nor the services which it was destined to render to mankind. They did not foresee that the insignificant looking tuber would prove a greater boon to the people of Europe, and exercise more influence on their destiny than the more brilliant and attractive mineral products of the Cordilleras, which proved in the end to be the bane and the ruin of the Spanish nation.

For the potato, since that time, owing to the readiness with which it adapts itself to different climates, and the abundant return with which, under favourable conditions, it rewards the toil of the farmer, has become an element of the daily food of millions of the human race, as necessary and important as the different varieties of grain known to the Old World previously to its introduction.

Admitted to the tables of the rich, under some one of the many disguises created by the inventive genius of culinary art, it appears in its primitive state at those of the poor, where, served up in its "jacket," and with no other condiments than salt and hunger, it forms, only too often, the sole dish. But when, less than half a century ago, in that country which, more than any other, had relied on the potato as an article of food, a sudden blight destroyed in a few days the hopes of the husbandman, the wealthy, no less than the humble, felt the disaster, and the potato famine, by the bitter memories it left in the minds of the Irish people, and the impetus it gave to emigration, produced wide-spreading and untoward results, of which we do not as yet deservy the termination.

The potato belongs to one of the most widely-diffused orders of plants, the *Solanaceæ*, the members of which, indigenous in most parts of the world, are remarkable by the variety and the opposition of their qualities, many of them being of the greatest utility to man, while the others are deadly poisons. To the first category may be referred the potato (*solanum tuberosum*), the egg-plant (*solanum melongena*), the tomato (*solanum lycopersicum*), and the capsicum. In the second are comprised the venomous deadly

nightshade (*atropa belladonna*), whose purple flowers are well known in our hedge-rows; the still more venomous mandragore (*atropa mandragora*), said by mediæval folklore to utter such fearful shrieks when torn from the ground as to drive mad whoever heard them: the *datura stramonium* and the henbane (*hyoscyamus*). All these plants are distinguished by their narcotic properties, and their power of causing hallucinations, whence they have been employed by thieves to drug their victims, and by the sorcerers of antiquity to make their dupes see visions. At the present day some of them are still used medicinally, in very small quantities, and with proper precautions. Last, but not least, tobacco (*nicotiana tabacum*), also a member of this very comprehensive order, would probably be placed without hesitation by its votaries in the first rank of the *Solanaceæ* useful to man, while its adversaries, following in the footsteps of King James I., would quite as probably relegate it among the deadly poisons.

The first tubers known in Europe under the name of potatoes were of a different order of plants from those which now bear that name. It was during Magalhaen's journey round the world (1519-1522) that Pigafetta, an Italian naturalist who accompanied him, saw, in Brazil, the Batata, or sweet potato, one of the *Convolvulaceæ*. We do not, however, know if it was thence brought to Spain, or at a later epoch from Peru, but it was most probably the Spaniards and the Portuguese who introduced it into their colonies in the East, and it is now cultivated in India, China, Japan, the Southern States of the Union, and in Italy. In England the trade with Spain made it known as an article of commerce under the names of "potades" or "potatoes," a corruption of the Spanish, and it seems to have been in demand for making conserves and sweetmeats.

A little later, on the invasion of Peru, the Spaniards became acquainted with a root called "papa," resembling the batata, but of a hardier nature; and from the descriptions of it given by the historians of the Conquest, it would seem to be what we now know as the potato. For centuries before the arrival of the Spaniards the Peruvian Incas had paid great attention to the development of agriculture, and as the "papa" formed the principal nutriment of the inhabitants of the higher and colder regions, unsuited to the cultivation of maize or batatas, it must have been an object of special care, since the names of as many as eleven varieties are to be found in dictionaries of the Peruvian language.

Pedro de Ciesa, a companion of Pizarro\* and Garcilaso de la

---

\* "Chronica del Peru, de Pedro de Cieza de Leon." Antwerp, 1554.  
Page 243.

Vega,\* the earliest writers who describe the "papa," state that the Indians crush the tubers to expel the water, then dry them in the sun, and thus prepare a food called *Chuño*, which can be preserved for a considerable time.

The *Papas Peruanorum* or *Hispanorum*, as it was now called, was introduced by the Spaniards about the middle of the sixteenth century into Italy; where, on account of its resemblance to the truffle, it was called *Taratufolo*. It was brought into Germany a little later. Charles de l'Ecluse (better known, perhaps, by his Latinized name of Clusius), Director of the Imperial Gardens at Vienna, under the Emperors Maximilian II. and Rudolph II., received some tubers in 1588 from Philippe de Sivry, Lord of Waldheim and Governor of Mons, who had got them from a member of the Court of the Papal Legate. These tubers had been brought from Italy, where, as Clusius says, they were already so generally cultivated as to be used for feeding pigs. He recognized their identity with the *Papas Peruanorum* described by Cieza, but the classification of the plant among the *Solanaceæ*, under the name which it still bears, of *Solanum tuberosum*, was the work of a contemporary botanist, Gaspar Bauhin, of Bâle. The latter received in 1590 from Scholtz, of Breslau, a drawing of the plant designated as *Papas Hispanorum*, and described it under its new name in his *Phytopinax*, published in 1596. In his edition of Matthioli's works (1598), and again, in his edition of the "Kreuterbuch," of Tabernæmontanus (1613), Bauhin states that the plant was already cultivated in Burgundy and in France; that the Germans knew it by the name of "Grüblingbaum," or truffle-tree, and that it had been first brought into England, and thence into France, from the "Island of Virginia." In his edition of the "Kreuterbuch," he adds to the preceding details, that the Virginians call it "Openauk," and the English, "Potatoes of Virginia." It will be shown later on whence he derived this information. When, however, Bauhin states that in Burgundy the use of these roots had been forbidden from the belief that they caused leprosy, and that they were there called "Indian artichokes," he is probably referring to the Topinambour or Jerusalem artichoke (*Helianthus tuberosus*) which, according to Parkinson,† the French had brought from Canada, and was known in England, about the same time, under the name of "Potatoes of Canada."

The exact date of the introduction of the potato into these islands, and the name of the person to whom we owe it, are

\* "Historia General del Peru, o Commentarios reales de los Incas." Nueva edición. Madrid, 1800. Vol. iii. p. 31.

† Paradisi in sole Paradisus Terrestris, 1629.

still matters of uncertainty. It has always been maintained that, in 1565, Sir John Hawkins brought the potato from Santa Fé in Venezuela, and that Sir Walter Raleigh brought it into Ireland from Virginia in 1586. But the chronicler of Sir John Hawkins' travels merely states that at Santa Fé the Indians came to them with potatoes and pine-apples for sale; the word "potato" meaning at that time only, the batata, which must have been already well known as an article of commerce, while the root we now call the potato did not receive that name till many years later. Sir Walter Raleigh's claim is not better founded. He made, it is true, several unsuccessful attempts to establish a colony in North America, but he never visited Virginia. The first expedition was sent by him in 1584, under the command of Captains Philip Armadas and Arthur Barlowe, who took possession of the islands of Wokokon and Roanoake, off the coast of what is now North Carolina, and gave to the latter island the name of Virginia. The following year a second expedition of seven ships, commanded by Sir Richard Grenville, brought out a colony of over one hundred persons and left them at Roanoake, with Master Ralph Lane as Governor. The colonists explored the neighbouring mainland for a considerable distance, but many of them seem to have been unsuited for the hardships of a settler's life, and they were soon anxious to return. In June, 1586, Sir Francis Drake stopped at Roanoake, on his way back from Cartagena, and the colonists, disheartened at the non-arrival of a ship laden with provisions which was to have come in the spring, persuaded him to take them back to England. In 1587, a more numerous colony, comprising women and children, was sent under the command of Mr. John White, who returned to England after a few months, at the request of his companions, to procure additional supplies. He came back to Roanoake in 1590, but found none of the colonists, who had probably passed over to the mainland, and a violent storm obliged him to desist from seeking them, and to make sail for England. A letter from him to Hakluyt, dated from his house "at Newtown in Kylmore, 1593," shows that he settled down in Ireland. Sir Walter Raleigh's patent for the discovering and planting of new lands expired in 1590, and no further attempts were made to colonize Virginia till 1606.

To a colonist therefore, returned from one of these voyages, may be ascribed in all probability our knowledge of the potato. Now, among those who took part in the second expedition was a friend and former teacher of Sir Walter Raleigh, named Thomas Heriot, whose scientific acquirements pointed him out to Master Ralph Lane, the Governor of the colony, as the most capable of composing a detailed account of the country and its products.

Heriot, in his "Briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia," gives a list of "Such commodities as Virginia is known to yield for victuals and sustenance of man's life usually fed on by the naturall inhabitants as also by us during the time of our abode," and among the roots which "are found growing naturally or wilde," he places first the "Openauk." "A kind of roots of round forme, some of the bignesse of walnuts, some farre greater; which are found in moist and marish grounds, growing many together one by another in ropes, as though they were fastened with a string. Being boyled or sodden, they are very good meat. Monardes calleth these roots Beades or Pater-nostri of Santa Helena."

Heriot does not say that he brought back any of these roots to England, but Gerard, the first English botanist who described the potato, says: "Clusius reports that it grows naturally in America, since which time I have received roots hereof from Virginia which grow and prosper in my garden as in their owne native countrey. The Indians call the fruit *Pappus*, meaning the roots, by which name also the common potatoes are called in these Indian countries."

Now, the first edition of Gerard's "Herbal" was published in 1597, and the immediately preceding edition of the "Rariorum Plantarum Historia" of Clusius in 1583. It would therefore seem that Clusius, who did not receive the tubers from Italy till 1588, must have described the *Papas Peruanorum* from the work of Cieza de Leon, published at Antwerp in 1554, and from the "Historia Generale de los Indios" of Gomara (Antwerp, 1554), and that, when the Virginian roots were brought to Gerard he identified them with the Peruvian plant. Gerard then goes on to compare them with the *Battatas Hispanorum*, or sweet potatoes, described in his preceding chapter, and then known in England by the names of *Potatoes*, *Potatus*, and *Potades*; and says, "because it (the new plant) hath not onely the shape and proportion of potatoes, but also the pleasant taste and virtues of the same, we may call it in English, Potatoes of America or Virginia." That Gerard attached some importance to his new acquisition may be surmised from the fact that he is represented on the title-page of the "Herbal" holding a stalk of the potato with its leaves and flowers. He does not, however, mention the name of "Openauk," nor state from whom he received the tubers. It is true that the writer of a paper on the potato, in a recent number of the *Gardeners' Chronicle*,\* has pointed out that it is not known whether the figure of the potato in the first edition of the "Herbal" was engraved in England or

\* W. S. Mitchell, *Gardeners' Chronicle*, April 17th, 1886, vol. xxv.

abroad, nor if it represents the plant which grew in Gerard's garden. Bauhin, however, as we have seen, acknowledges the identity of the *Papas Hispanorum*, which he had called *Solanum tuberosum*, with the *Openauk*, of which he had learned the name from Heriot's travels,\* and the "potatoes of Virginia," the name given by Gerard. We can only conclude that, though the potato is not indigenous in the tropical regions of America, it seems to have existed in such widely-separated districts as Peru and North Carolina, and to have been brought in the same century from the former country by the Spaniards, and from the latter by the English. It is a remarkable coincidence, that about the time of Drake's return from Virginia, Sir Walter Raleigh obtained a grant of a large territory in Ireland, and took over to it colonists from the South of England. The disappointed adventurers who had failed in their first attempt at emigration, may very probably have joined the new expedition. Some of them were certainly Irish, for, in the list of the persons under the command of Master Ralph Lane, are to be found the names of Edward Kelly, Edward Nugent, John Gostigo (Costigan?), and we have seen that the leader of the second colony, Mr. John White, settled in Ireland. These are the only well-ascertained facts, by means of which any date can be assigned for the introduction of the potato into England, or any foundation given for the origin of the tradition that Sir Walter Raleigh brought it to Ireland.

For many years the cultivation of the tuber made but little progress in the United Kingdom. In Scotland it became known in Kirkcudbright as late as 1725, in Stirlingshire in 1728, and in Forfarshire in 1730. It was not till 1740 that a season of peculiar severity gave the first impulse to the more extensive cultivation of a root which promised to be an effectual remedy against such a visitation. It was at that time, however, raised only by spade culture, which required more exertion than the slovenly farmers of those days cared to submit to, and it was generally believed that it could be preserved only by being left in the earth where it grew. The potato, therefore, was not grown on an extensive scale, and it was only about 1790, when farming had come to be better understood, and practised throughout Scotland, that its value was fully recognized and that it met with the attention it deserved.†

The same want of appreciation of the potato long prevailed in England. In Lancashire, where it was probably brought from

\* Bauhin, "Prodromus Theatri Botanici," Frankfort, 1620, p. 90.

† "The Potato Rescued from Disease." William Aitken. Edinburgh, 1833.  
Royal Dublin Society Collection of Pamphlets, vol. 201.

Ireland, it was planted in the fields in 1634, but it is only a little more than a hundred years since its cultivation became general. When Arthur Young made his tours through England, between 1767 and 1770, he found that in very extensive tracts of the country over which he travelled, potatoes were not a common article of culture; but, that in the north, more farmers grew them than in the south or east. A Mr. Turner, of Kirk-leatham, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, seems to have been most successful, having raised as much as 1166 bushels on an acre; but the average production of all the places visited by Young was 377 bushels to the acre.

We have seen that the statement that the potato was cultivated in Burgundy in the sixteenth century may probably have referred to the Topinambour, from an erroneous belief in the identity of the two plants; but in the seventeenth it is said to have been cultivated in Lorraine and the district of Lyons.\* Turgot, however, was the first to point out its utility during a famine which occurred while he was *Intendant* of Limousin, between 1761 and 1773, and he had at first great difficulty in conquering the prejudices of the people, who only consented to make use of it after *M. l'Intendant* had had it served up at his own table.

The efforts of Antoine Augustin Parmentier in the same direction were more successful. His attention was first drawn to the cultivation of the potato by the prize offered in 1771 by the Academy of Besançon for the discovery of alimentary substances which might compensate for the deficiency of corn at a time of scarcity. He gained the prize by an essay, in which he demonstrated the nutritious qualities of the starch contained in many plants; and later, after the publication of his "Examen Chimique de la Pomme d'terre," he obtained from the Government leave to sow with potatoes 54 acres of a sterile tract, near Versailles, called *La Plaine des Sablons*. At first, the incredulous public laughed at the seemingly hopeless undertaking; but, when the plants grew up, Parmentier presented a bouquet of the flowers to Louis XVI. The King, who had always been favourably inclined to Parmentier, accepted them willingly, and appeared in public wearing them in his button-hole. The patronage of Royalty rendered the plant at once fashionable; the prejudices existing against it disappeared, and the Government was enabled to spread its culture throughout the Provinces.

The utility of the potato was recognized at an earlier date in Germany than in France, owing chiefly to the widely-spread misery caused by the Thirty Years' War. It was known in the middle of the seventeenth century in Hesse-Darmstadt, Saxony,

\* Meyer's "Conversations Lexicon," vol. ix.

Westphalia, and Brunswick ; in 1716 in Bamberg, Baireuth, and Baden ; but it did not reach Leipzig till 1740 ; and about the same time emigrants from the Palatinate brought it to Prussia. Its cultivation there went far to alleviate the distress resulting from the Seven Years' War ; and Frederic II. took energetic measures to spread it in Pomerania and Silesia. It became known in Sweden in 1726, in Berne in 1730, and in Bohemia and Hungary in 1770. Towards the close of the eighteenth century it was extensively cultivated throughout Germany, but it was only after the wars of Napoleon that it began to be used for the production of the potato spirit, which now forms such an important branch of German commerce.

It has been already shown that Italy was one of the first countries in Europe to receive the potato from the Spaniards, but we do not know the exact date. Targioni-Tozzetti mentions the introduction of tubers from England into Tuscany in 1767, but states that the plant was known and cultivated there long previously, and probably at Vallombrosa. Padre Magazzini, of that Monastery, in a posthumous work on Agriculture in Tuscany, printed at Venice in 1625,\* asserts that it had been brought from Spain and Portugal by Fathers of the Order of Discalced Carmelites, but assigns no date. There were, however, parts of Italy where it was not known till the end of the last century ; for, an inscription recently placed in the village of Lazzate, in Lombardy, on the house of Alessandro Volta, the inventor of the electric pile, states that "the country people in their gratitude for the American tuber, which he was the first to bring to these parts, called him the beneficent magician."

The mode of cultivating the potato, generally adopted at the present day, consists in giving the ground a first ploughing in autumn and a second in spring, followed by a harrowing, as a complete pulverization of the soil is essential for the success of the crop. The land is then ploughed into ridgelets or drills, with an interval of thirty inches between each ; and manure having been spread along the bottom of the drills, the potatoes, cut into sets, are planted upon it at every ten or twelve inches ; another ploughing then splits the drills, covering the cuttings with from four to five inches of earth. A soil of deep sandy loam, perfectly dry and well drained, and a plentiful supply of farm-yard manure, are necessary for the production of potatoes of the best quality, for the plant has a decided antipathy to a stiff wet clay, and will never flourish in a shallow retentive soil. The amount of manure it requires is larger than that employed for any other crop. In

---

\* "Lezioni d'Agricoltura," II. p. 10, quoted by M. F. Dunal, "Histoire des Solanum," Paris, 1813.

Scotland it receives from 20 to 40 tons of farm-yard manure per acre, with from 5 to 10 cwt.s. of artificial manures; while the market-gardeners near London frequently give it 60 tons, and in some cases even as much as 100.

A series of experiments on the effect of various manures on the growth of the potato has been carried out during twelve years by Sir John Bennet Lawes, at Rothamsted, on a piece of rather exhausted land, and the results were recently published by Dr. J. H. Gilbert, Professor of Rural Economy in the University of Oxford.\* From these experiments it appears that nitrogenous manures alone, such as ammonium salts or nitrate of soda, gave less increase of produce than a mixed mineral manure alone, containing superphosphate of lime and salts of potash, soda, and magnesia. The combination, however, of ammonium salts or nitrate of soda, with mixed mineral manure, gave nearly twice as much produce as the mineral manure alone, and much more than twice as much as the nitrogenous manure alone. Farm-yard manure, containing an abundance of mineral matters, as well as organic substances rich in carbon, and about 200 lbs of nitrogen in the 14 tons applied annually per acre, gave much less produce than mineral manures combined with ammonium salts or nitrate of soda supplying only 86 lbs. of nitrogen per acre. The reason is, that by far the larger proportion of the nitrogen contained in farm-yard manure remains long inactive and is only slowly available, but the addition of nitrogen in the more readily utilizable form of nitrate of soda produces at once an effect. Farm-yard manure, however, is always largely applied to the potato. Its beneficial effects probably consist chiefly in its influence on the soil which becomes more porous and permeable to the roots; while its temperature is increased by the decomposition of the organic matter in the manure, and its mineral components are rendered more soluble by the carbonic acid evolved in the decomposition.

Among other interesting facts ascertained in the course of this remarkable series of carefully performed experiments, it was proved that the plant does not seem capable of assimilating the nitrogen supplied to it, unless when accompanied with a certain amount of mineral manures, when it takes up a very considerably increased quantity; and, further, that under the influence of a mixture of mineral and nitrogenous manures, it takes up the largest amount of potash. The effect of this constituent is to render the crop heavier, for though its exact mode of operation is uncertain, it is proved that its presence is essential for the

\* "The Science of Potato Growing." Results of Experiments at Rothamsted in the Growth of Potatoes, by J. H. Gilbert, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. Reprinted from the *Agricultural Students' Gazette*, Cirencester.

formation of the chief non-nitrogenous substances, starch and sugar.

That terrible scourge, the potato disease, which has hitherto defied every remedy that has been suggested, and by its annual recurrence continues to destroy a certain proportion of every crop, has also been the subject of careful study and research at Rothamsted. Before, however, stating the results of Dr. Gilbert's investigations, it may be well to enter into some details with regard to the history and the nature of the malady.

The entire tribe of *solanaceæ* seem to be liable to the same disease as the potato; but, while the plants indigenous to this country, and thriving vigorously in their wild state, are able to resist the parasitical growth; the potato, a stranger to our climate, not as yet naturalized, and enfeebled by a long course of forced cultivation, easily succumbs. After the introduction of the tuber into Europe, the first malady which attacked it was known as the "curl." In this disease the leaves shrivel and crumple, the stems are puny and the tubers rot. It was first observed in 1764, and during 60 or 70 years it ravaged districts situated in widely-separated countries.\* In the south of France it was called "*friolee*," in Flanders "*pivre*."<sup>†</sup> It prevailed again from 1831 to 1837, disappearing in that year and re-appearing in 1838, and was the immediate forerunner of the disease of 1845. It is now recognized as a form of the true potato murrain; and, in fact, a disease perfectly similar to the latter was described by Parmentier in 1789, and supposed by him to have been caused by undrained land and a superabundance of moisture. The present malady is said to have appeared at St. Helena in 1840, in England the following year, and at various dates about this time in North America.<sup>‡</sup> In the year 1845 it burst out suddenly in Europe, devastating entire territories, and causing a fearful amount of misery which, in these islands especially, it is needless to describe. No efficacious remedy has been as yet discovered, but the progress of microscopical science and the greater perfection to which its instruments have been brought, have enabled us at least to ascertain and study the cause of the disease, the fungus known as *Peronospora infestans*. This fungus appears first in the leaf-cells, especially during the warm and showery weather so prevalent during the last days of July. It breaks up the cellular tissue and causes a putrescence which shows itself on the under side of the leaves in purplish or blackish spots, gradually extending till they become confluent

\* Paper by Earl Cathcart. "Journal Roy. Agricult. Soc. of England," vol. **xx.**, 1884, p. 266.

<sup>†</sup>"*Histoire des Solanum*," M. T. Dunal, p. 29.

<sup>‡</sup> Earl Cathcart.

and the leaves perish. On their destruction, the fungus descends by the stem, or its spores are washed by the rain to the tubers in the ground. In either case the entire plant is reduced to a putrid mass and exhales an offensive odour.

Such are the outward and visible features of the disease, only too apparent to the most superficial observer; the more abstruse questions of the development of the fungus and the effect of its growth on the chemical composition of the tuber, have been thoroughly elucidated by the series of experiments carried on at Rothamsted. The results of these experiments show that, where there has been the most liberal supply of nitrogen, and therefore the most luxuriant growth of tubers, there will be found not only the richest juice (for 80 per cent. of the total nitrogen of the tuber is to be found in the juice) and the latest maturity (for the juice includes a good deal of not finally-fixed matter, the material for further maturation) but also the largest proportion of diseased tubers. The juice, in fact, supplies food to the fungus, especially when a wet season favours its development. In the early stage of the malady the action of the fungus on the tuber consists in the destruction of starch and the formation of sugar. The latter is decomposed in its turn and serves as nutriment to the fungus. The non-nitrogenous elements of the tuber being thus annihilated, the fungus, as the disease progresses, continues to grow by accumulating in itself the mineral matter and the nitrogenous substance, until the utter destruction of the entire tuber.

Of the various remedies suggested from time to time, with but little practical result hitherto, the best seem to be the frequent adoption of new varieties obtained by raising the plant from seed, and the careful heaping of the earth about the stems. The latter system of cultivation, recently pointed out by Professor Jansen, of Copenhagen, was known as far back as 1764, the year, as already mentioned, of the first apparition of the "curl," when the *Gentleman's Magazine* recommended moulding up monthly, or even fortnightly. It has also been thought that the *Solanum Maglia*, a species discovered by Darwin on the Chonos Islands, off the coast of Patagonia, might be better fitted to resist the cold damp climate of these islands than the *Solanum Tuberosum*, a native of a comparatively dry region. But no very active steps seem to have been taken as yet to spread its cultivation.

The chief value of the potato as an article of food consists almost exclusively in the starch which it contains; a heat-producing and fat-forming element. The amount of its nitrogenous or flesh-forming constituents necessary to repair the waste of muscular tissue is so small, that when it is employed as the prin-

cipal article of diet, the addition of milk or some other nitrogenous substance is indispensable. As, moreover, by far the larger part of the nitrogen which exists in the potato as albuminoid, or flesh-forming compounds, is in a soluble condition in the juice, if the potato is peeled and put into cold water before being cooked, as is usually the custom, a large proportion of these nutritive matters, as well as the potash and phosphoric acid, is washed out and wasted. It is advisable, therefore, to imitate the more primitive, but really more scientific method of the Irish peasant, who boils and serves up the potatoes in their skins, thereby retaining the ingredients which would be eliminated by a more refined system of cookery.

The statistics collected by Dr. Gilbert, relating to the culture of the potato in fourteen countries where it is most extensively grown, show that the total area under the crop is 22,425,390 acres, of which 556,848 are in Great Britain and 798,258 in Ireland. The aggregate produce is estimated at 67,373,870 tons, of which Great Britain furnishes 3,418,591 and Ireland 3,113,304. The largest average yield per acre is in Great Britain, where it amounts to about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  tons; while in Ireland it is less than four tons. Among the Continental countries Norway stands first with an average of 6.01 tons per acre; Belgium, Holland, and Italy come next with a little over four, while Germany, where the potato occupies an area thirteen times as large as in Great Britain, produces only 3.31 tons per acre; and France, with about six times as much land under the crop as in Great Britain, produces only 2.80. The lowest average is in the United States, where four times the area, as in Great Britain, is devoted to the potato, but where the yield is only 1.87 tons per acre, or less than one-third as much.

D. SAMPSON.

---

## ART. V.—“THE SACRIFICES OF MASSES.”

1. *Roman Catholic Claims.* By Rev. CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford. Third Edition. London : Rivingtons. 1890.
2. *What are the Catholic Claims?* By Rev. AUSTIN RICHARDSON, late Professor at the “Institut St. Louis,” Brussels. With an Introduction by Rev. LUKE RIVINGTON. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1889.

EVER since the rise of the Oxford Movement, the 31st Article of the Anglican Creed has been a difficulty in the path of Advanced High Churchmen. This Article in the plainest language proclaims that “the Sacrifices of Masses” were “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” Now, the Advanced High Churchman not only delights in calling the Office for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, the Mass, but he holds, more or less correctly, as he is more or less advanced, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

Since the appearance of Tract 90, long ago refuted by its distinguished author, consolation is found in the plural form used in this article. It is maintained that the condemnation of the Sacrifices of Masses leaves untouched the Sacrifice of the Mass! Admitting, by pure hypothesis, that the words are not identical, is it possible to imagine a Catholic Christian, nay, any one possessing one spark of love and reverence, making use of such gross and outrageous terms in connection with words, whose very sound recalls irresistibly that bloodless Offering of the Lamb of God, the loving and Divine Saviour of the World?

If these words proved nothing else they would prove at least that the Established Church, in its official capacity, was utterly devoid of all decency and of all Catholic instinct.

But, as I point out to Mr. Gore in my book, “What are the Catholic Claims?” (p. 142) this explanation will not bear a moment’s serious examination. These words, “The Sacrifices of Masses,” are perfectly correct, and are the Catholic expression for denominating the repeated Celebrations of the Holy Sacrifice. The very words are used in this sense by the Council of Florence (see Decree of Union, signed by the Orientals in 1438).

The Reformers, unlike the modern Ritualists, were perfectly conversant with that Catholic phraseology in which they had been reared, and use it with theological precision when they intend to blaspheme the old religion.

Mr. Gore, in "The Roman Catholic Claims," takes other ground. He affirms that the 31st Article is aimed against the doctrine (in the words of the Article "commonly" taught) that, whereas Christ offered the Sacrifice of the Cross for the remission of Original sin, He instituted the Sacrifice of the Mass for the remission of daily Actual sin, both mortal and venial.

Here let me at once remark that no such error is condemned in the Article, or even hinted at. Not one word about the distinct effects of these two Sacrifices is mentioned. What is plainly condemned is the Catholic doctrine that "in the Sacrifices of Masses the priest doth offer Christ to have remission of pain or guilt." Now, this is precisely what the Church of God does teach.

However, as I point out to Mr. Gore, this supposed error, although utterly foreign to the dogma condemned by the Article, was brought against the Catholics at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, and, as Bossuet relates, was as absolutely denied by them. The Catholics present were not satisfied with indignantly denying the calumny, they challenged the Lutherans to quote one of their theologians who maintained such a blasphemy; and, as Bossuet adds, this is acknowledged by the Lutherans themselves ("Variations," English Trans., vol. i. p. 112. New York: J. Doyle. 1836). I then repeated this challenge to Mr. Gore. It is his answer to my challenge in his third edition, dated 1890, which is the subject and cause of the present article. Mr. Gore quotes one, no Catholic can deny to be a great authority indeed, none other than the blessed Albert, the great Bishop of Ratisbon, the saintly Master of the Angel of the Schools, St. Thomas Aquinas. He adds these painful words:—

That this doctrine was not only once stated, but became current and prevalent is shown by the language of the Confession of Augsburg, &c.—(p. 176).

After the words of Bossuet, which I had quoted to him, these lines are difficult to characterize, or even to understand, when coming from the pen of so loyal and high-minded a writer as Mr. Gore, one whom it is impossible not to admire, and (for me at least) impossible not to esteem. The very question before us was the truth of this Lutheran accusation: and, behold, Mr. Gore brings as a proof that this doctrine not only existed, but was "current and prevalent,"—what?—*the accusation itself!*

Surely if the existence of the accusation proves its truth, the equally certain existence of the indignant denial and the challenge to produce one theologian in its favour, proves at least that it was neither "current nor prevalent," but rather unknown to the Catholics, at least in 1530.

But let me translate the quotation itself as it appears in the work of Mr. Gore.\* It is as follows:—

The second cause of the institution of this Sacrament is the Sacrifice of the Altar as a remedy for the daily ravages caused by our sins. So that as the Body of Christ was once offered on the Cross for the original debt, so is it continually offered on the Altar for our daily faults, and thus the Church has in this an offering to appease God more precious and acceptable than all the Sacraments and Sacrifices of the Old Law.†

Now, I do not deny that these words taken as they stand, apart from their context, might convey the impression they made on Mr. Gore. A cultured Anglican, unversed in the study of the Scholastics, reading this passage alone, might be tempted so to understand these words. But I cannot for a moment consider this as the slightest excuse for Mr. Gore. I deny to any serious man, writing on a serious subject, the right to be superficial. Mr. Gore has the reputation of a theologian, if he did not believe himself to be one, it would be an impertinence to address the public in such books as "The Roman Catholic Claims." Mr. Gore is *bound* to have studied Scholastic Theology. He has no right, like a Dr. Littledale, to dip into a work of 24 folio volumes, and to extract a detached sentence. He knows—he must know—that the Scholastics took theological matters very seriously; that, as in duty bound, they looked upon a doctrine from all its possible points of view, that they carefully analyzed it by numerous thoughtful distinctions, and then, gathering up these various elements, each one of which had been made clear and plain to the student, they formed them into definitions, which the wisdom of modern times has rarely found it necessary to modify.

\* In Mr. Gore's book the passage is in Latin.

† Secunda causa institutionis hujus sacramenti (Eucharistiae) est Sacrificium Altaris, contra quandam quotidiam delictorum nostrorum rapinam. Ut sicut corpus Christi *semel oblatum est* in cruce pro debito originali, sic *offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in Altari*, et habeat in hoc Ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deus, super omnia Legis Sacraenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum (De Sac Euch Sacrament Sermones op B. Alberti, Ed. Lugduni, 1651, tom. xii. p. 250). I may mention incidently that the "Opusculum De Sac Euch Sacrament Sermones" is not *certainly* by the B. Albert. It is ascribed by some to St. Thomas Aquinas himself, and is very much in his style. It is to be found in the Roman Editon of his works, Inter Opuscula, N. LVIII. Item in Editione data Vendii, 1593, tom. 17, opus 58, Item Parmae 1552-69, tom. 17 2<sup>a</sup>, Pars opuse 51, p. 135. Quetif & Echard, tom. i. Scriptores Ord Praed, p. 340, col. 2, consider it the work of the B. Albert. If by St. Thomas, the authority is even greater, and the true doctrine concerning the all-sufficiency of Christ's redemption, passion, and death on the Cross, is as clearly taught in his works as in those of his great Master.

What, then, is the doctrine of the blessed Albertus Magnus consistently taught throughout his voluminous works, on the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar?

I am writing this article for the general reader; my aim is to make this important matter clear to any one of ordinary culture. I will therefore abstain from technical terms, and from the peculiar Latin of the Schools, as far as is compatible with a thorough examination of the subject. I will endeavour to show, not only the beauty, but the necessity of these distinctions. They are not a mere subtle play upon words, they are on the contrary a careful, methodical, necessary analysis of the doctrine of man's Redemption and of his reconciliation with an offended God.

I maintain, then, the following Theses:—

I. The Catholic Church teaches, and has ever taught, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by His sacred Passion and precious death on the Cross, consummated once and for ever the meritorious work of man's Redemption. That on the Cross He offered a full, perfect, and superabundant satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, original and actual.

II. That this doctrine was never denied by any approved theologian, either before or after the Reformation.

III. That, in particular, the blessed Albertus Magnus plainly and repeatedly teaches this doctrine, not only in various parts of his works, but in the very treatise quoted by Mr. Gore.

IV. The words quoted by Mr. Gore do *not* deny this doctrine, but they are merely an application of a truth recognized by all Catholic theologians.

As for the first Thesis, I have only to refer the reader to the sublime—I had almost said Divine—teaching of the Council of Trent,\* especially those chapters and canons having to do with Justification and the Holy Eucharist.

As for the second Thesis, I affirm it as a fact, and leave, as it is my right to do, the task of proving that any approved Catholic theologian has denied Catholic doctrines, to my adversary.

In this article I am concerned only with Theses III. and IV.

I say, then, firstly, that the blessed Albertus Magnus plainly and repeatedly affirms the Catholic doctrine of the sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice upon the Cross (regarded as the consummation and the crown of His Incarnation and Divine life).

I have given much time and labour to collect for myself and to verify, indications kindly sent me by learned theologians, whose

---

\* See Can. and Dec. of Trent, translated by Rev. J. Waterworth. Burns and Oates.

names I give with my grateful acknowledgments at the end of this article.

In the British Museum I found the edition quoted by Mr. Gore (Lugduni, 1651). It is a magnificent work in 24 fol. vols., bound in white vellum, with a coat of arms stamped in gold on the covers.

The blessed Albertus Magnus gives us his doctrine concerning the mystery of man's Redemption in his great work on the Sentences. Had Mr. Gore examined the 15th and 16th Vol. of the edition he quotes, he would have spared himself the injustice of attributing heresy to this saintly doctor.

To quote all that he teaches concerning the sufficiency of the Sacrifice of the Cross for the satisfaction, not only of original, but also of actual sin, it would be necessary to transcribe almost all that is said under Distinctio XIX., pages 187 and 188 of Vol. XV., but a few examples will suffice. Among many other questions regarding our Lord's Passion and Death, he asks : " In what manner does Christ by His death redeem us from Satan and from sin ? " " How and from what penalties does Christ redeem us by His Death ? " " Does Christ's Passion redeem us from both eternal and temporal penalties ? " and in his answers to all these he plainly shows that he is speaking not only of original but *more especially of actual sins* when he proves that we obtain redemption from them *all* by Christ's death.

He asks again : " If our justification from sin is the work of Christ's Passion ? " " If Christ by His death destroyed *by this one sacrifice* all the effects of sin ? " " If by the shedding of the blood of Christ the sinless victim, the entire handwriting (chirographa), or condemnation against all sins, was effaced ? " and to all these he answers in the affirmative.

Under Distinctio XX., he asks : " Whether Original sin only, or Actual sin also, rendered a Redeemer necessary. He first gives seven reasons to prove that Christ's Passion and Death effect redemption, not only from Original sin but also from Actual sin. He then brings up three objections or difficulties, and, lastly, gives the doctrine which is to be held " Dicendum, quod consentiendum est rationibus primis." He then solves the three objections.

But not only in this volume, and as we shall show later on, in those parts of his works when the blessed Albert is speaking, *ex professo*, of the Blessed Sacrament, does he maintain that Our Blessed Lord offered full satisfaction for all sins upon the Cross ; but in the very treatise quoted by Mr. Gore, *only a few lines distant* from the words he condemns, does our holy Doctor plainly teach this truth. Thus, in explaining the words of the

Psalm lxviii., "Persecuti sunt me inimici mei injuste : quæ non rapui, tunc exolvebam, dum scilicet pro debitis omnium sufficiens sacrificium in cruce offerebam."

"My enemies persecuted me unjustly, then did I pay that which I took not away, that is to say, when I offered up on the Cross a sufficient sacrifice for the sins (or the debts due to the sins) of all." Surely we may ask if Mr. Gore really even opened any one of the 24 volumes of the Blessed Albertus Magnus, and if he did not merely content himself with transcribing an extract given him by some friend.

Lastly, I maintain that the words quoted by Mr. Gore do not contradict the doctrine of the perfect satisfaction offered for all sin by Our Blessed Lord upon the Cross, but are merely the application of a truth acknowledged by all Catholic theologians.

And, firstly, I maintain that the words quoted by Mr. Gore do not contain even an *apparent contradiction* to this doctrine. The blessed Albert does not say that the Sacrifice of the Cross was offered *only* for the remission of Original sin, but he proclaims two Catholic truths: that Our Blessed Lord offered up satisfaction for Original sin on the Cross, and that, in the holy Sacrifice of the Altar, Christ is truly offered to obtain pardon for and remission of the daily sins of mankind. Why this distinction is here drawn between Original and Actual sin I will now proceed to show.

In the above-mentioned Distinctio XIX., Art. I, the Blessed Albert expresses himself thus:

Justification may be considered either in general or in particular, i.e., either as applying to the whole human race fallen in Adam, or to each individual of the race. But, again, justification may be considered in its cause. As a cause, justification may be considered from four points of view. We may inquire what is (a) its meritorious cause? (b) its efficient cause? (c) its sacramental cause? (d) its formal cause?

(a) The meritorious cause of man's justification was the Passion and Death of Christ upon the Cross (considered as the consummation and crown of His Incarnation and Divine life). By His Passion he merited "in condignum" (i.e., by absolute right, by paying a perfect superabundant ransom) the pardon and justification of all sin, Original and Actual.

(b) The efficient cause of man's justification is the Godhead. It was because by the Hypostatic Union Christ was not only true man, but also true God, that His sacrifice was efficacious and infinitely sufficient.

(c) The sacramental cause of man's justification, i.e., the means whereby the infinite merits of Christ's death are applied to each

individual soul, is, for original sin, Baptism; for post-baptismal actual sin, Penance."<sup>\*</sup>

But this is also true of the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, though in a different way. In Penance the merits of Christ's Death are applied to the individual soul by the judicial sentence of absolution for all mortal sins, and for those venial sins which are submitted to its jurisdiction. In the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar these merits are applied by offering the same holy Victim once slain on the Cross, and really present on the sacred Altar, to the Eternal Father, that by this offering, the merits of Christ's Passion may be applied to all men, on earth and in purgatory, for the remission of pain and guilt, *i.e.*, the guilt of sin and of all penalties due to sin, not for the remission of Original sin, already effaced by Baptism, but for the remission of Actual daily sins.

However, the blessed Albertus (in lib. 4 Sent. Dist. xiii. Art. 25, Vol. xvi. p. 211) explains that the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar was *not* ordained *directly* for the remission of sin, either mortal or venial, but rather for the strengthening of our souls against that weakness which is the *effect* both of Original and Actual sin.

The Sacrifice of the Cross was *once* (*semel*) offered, and by it meritorious satisfaction was given for all sin, Original and Actual. In Baptism the merits of this Sacrifice are *once* (*semel*) applied to each individual for the remission of Original sin. No new satisfaction is given, but the merits of Christ's Passion are applied to a particular soul.

In the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist these merits are frequently, over and over again, applied for the remission, not of Original sin already effaced in Baptism, but of Actual sin. This is why the blessed Albert speaks of the Sacrifice of the Cross being *once* offered for Original sin, and the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar being *daily* offered for Actual sin. Had he, by a prophetic vision, foreseen readers who, unlike the serious students of the Middle Ages, skim through a book instead of studying it, he would have spoken here more fully; but as he has elsewhere explained the Sacrifice of the Cross to be the meritorious cause of man's redemption and of all the graces of the Sacraments, and as he, in this very Treatise, explains that the Divine Sacrifices of Masses are not new and distinct sacrifices, but one and the same with that of the Cross, greater prolixity was not necessary, and would have been out of place.

The title of this treatise is "De Sacrosancto Eucharistiae Sacramento Sermones plane Divini," and takes up the portion of

---

\* Loc. cit.

vol. xii., from page 247 to page 300. The blessed Albertus first treats of the Blessed Sacrament as a Communion and then as a Sacrifice. Under this last heading he shows why the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass must be often offered. He quotes Paschasius:—"Although all sins are remitted in Baptism, nevertheless the infirmity of sin remains, and because we daily fall at least into venial sin, therefore Christ is daily offered, in order that He who by dying once conquered death, so by the Holy Sacrament He may deliver us daily from our frequent falls." But to show that this is no new sacrifice, he quotes the words of St. Ambrose:—"As what is offered everywhere is one and the same Body, so it is one and the same Sacrifice. Christ once on the Cross once offered a Sacrifice for all, and the same victim we now offer."\*

The blessed Albertus, with that wonderful completeness of the best scholastics, foresees the objection that this frequent offering of the Holy Sacrifice is an indignity offered to the Sacrifice once for all offered on the Cross. In the Fourth Book on the Sentences, Distinctio XIII., he asks if the Holy Mass is a real sacrifice, and if Christ is often immolated? He distinguishes as to the sense these words may mean, and then replies that that which is consecrated and offered is rightly to be called a sacrifice, because it is a memorial and representation of the true sacrifice and holy immolation made on the Altar of the Cross. Christ died upon the Cross, and there immolated Himself; but He is also daily immolated in the Blessed Sacrament, because therein is made a commemoration (*recordatio*) of what was once done. To the question whether Christ is immolated in every sacrifice, he answers in the affirmative, and then to the objection that by these words an occasion is given to heresy (for a representation of death signifies death, and "Christ risen from the dead dieth no more"), he replies that this would only be the case if it were asserted that Christ's death was reiterated, but the contrary is maintained. Again, to the objection that an injury is done to the perfect sufficiency of the one sacrifice, by which St. Paul says Christ offered Himself *once*, if we say that Christ offers Himself every day; he answers that no injury is offered to the Sacrifice of the Cross, because the *same thing* is always offered, "et sub uno effectu;" but if some other victim were sought for slaying, or for procuring our redemption, then, indeed, an injury would be offered to Christ's death.†

Seeking the cause of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, he mentions two—"the increase of Charity, and to have a remedy for our daily infirmities. Thus St. Ambrose, If, whenever Christ's blood is shed, it is shed for the remission of sin, I must always

\* Loc. cit. Pars. vi. Sermo xxv. p. 288.

† Art. XXIII.

receive it, who am always sinning. I must ever have recourse to the remedy." And, again, St. Augustine: "This oblation is daily repeated, although Christ suffered but once, because of our daily sins. . . . Because we fall daily, daily also Christ is in a mystical manner immolated for us."

This, then, in a few words, is the doctrine of the blessed Albertus Magnus, plainly set forth in his works, and as plainly taught in all ages by the Catholic Church: Our Divine Lord consummated the work of man's Redemption by His death on the Cross when He paid a full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; this is the "*Causa Meritoria*" of justification, and can never be repeated. The merits of this perfect satisfaction are applied to each individual soul for the remission of Original sin once only in Baptism, and frequently in Penance for the remission of Actual sin.

In the All Holy Sacrifice of the Mass the self-same victim, once slain upon the Cross, is offered daily for the application of those satisfactory merits obtained by the death of Christ upon the Cross, not for the remission of Original sin, already effaced by Baptism, but for the remission of Actual daily sins.

I have sufficient confidence in the loyalty of Mr. Gore to believe that he will lose no time, after reading this explanation, in admitting his mistake, and in acquitting our holy Doctor of heresy, in as public a manner as he unhappily made the accusation.

Mr. Gore, in his third edition, not satisfied with his attack on the blessed Albertus Magnus, brings up, with as little foundation, the charge of a new heresy forming in the Catholic Church of the present day. He says:

A view has recently become prevalent, both popularly and in theology, in the Roman Church, which makes each Mass a substantive sacrifice, distinct from, though dependent upon, the sacrifice of the Cross. Christ, it is contended, gives Himself afresh to be sacrificed in each Mass at the hands of the priest. Each Mass is a fresh "self-emptying," a fresh "immolation," a renewed reduction of Christ to a state of humiliation. Without this it would not be a proper sacrifice.  
—(p. 176.)

In this passage many distinctions would have to be made as to the use of the words "substantive," "distinct from," "gives Himself afresh."

But the Blessed Albertus has already treated the subject in the quotations we have given above. He there shows that, although with St. Augustine, we must admit that Christ is immolated daily, yet, nevertheless, no injury is thereby done to the Sacrifice of the Cross, because one and the same victim, once slain,

is offered. If the Holy Mass is a *real* Sacrifice, there must be in it a true self-emptying.

All Catholic theologians ever held that each celebration of Holy Mass is a proper, perfect, propitiatory sacrifice, *in the strictest sense of the words*, and that it contains *all* the essential qualities of a sacrifice. What has confused Mr. Gore, unacquainted with the language of the Schools, is the difference of opinion as to the exact essence of the mystical immolation of the Divine Victim; whether it consists in the mystical separation of the Body and Blood, by the separate consecration of the Species, or whether it does not rather consist in that mystical change, whereby the All Holy appears under such humble forms, and places His sacred Body and Blood in the power of the priest, not resisting even the awful profanations to which this Divine Sacrament is exposed. These differences of opinion on matters which are not revealed truths, merely prove the wise liberty of the Church, and the perfect unity of all her children on all dogmas of the Faith. "In dubiis libertas."

We Catholics have the right to complain, and to protest earnestly, against the careless levity with which seemingly thoughtful Protestants undertake to criticize our doctrines. Not to take higher grounds, Catholic theology has a sufficiently prominent place in the literary history of the world, to merit at least careful study and correct enunciation.

Like every Catholic writer, I had to suffer bitterly from this unseemly levity on the part of the critics of my book, "What are the Catholic Claims?" When such men as Canon MacColl, who passes for a theologian, and has lately given some lectures on the Nicene Creed, which are not without merit, ventures to review Catholic books like mine and those of Father Rivington, and in a cultured paper like the *Spectator*, gives such proofs of ignorance concerning doctrines very plainly taught in the Catholic child's Penny Catechism, when he calls definitions, *ex cathedra*, "if ever there have been such," speeches Pius IX. made to pilgrims at audiences granted them in the Vatican, when he imagines that, because some theologians consider the participation of three bishops in every consecration necessary, it is a proof that, therefore, they held to the necessity of three *distinct and independent consecrators*, surely it is time to cry out, and say: "Gentlemen, condemn us if you like, but at least hear first what we have got to say, so that you may know *what* you are condemning."

I cannot finish without offering my sincere and grateful thanks to Monsignor Abbeloos, Rector Magnificus of the famous University of Louvain, the Rev. Father Dommermuth, O.P., of the same University, and Rev. Father De Augustinis, S.J., the

learned Professor of the Roman University, for their valuable help. Without their indications I fear that I should never have been able to shape my article into a concise form, and I might have taken months and years to discover what I wanted with much labour, whereas, working under their guidance, my few weeks of study and research have been, for me, a most delightful, and, I trust, a profitable task.

AUSTIN RICHARDSON.

---

#### ART. VI.—AËROPÆDIA.

**A**RTIFICIAL flight is by no means an idea confined to mediaeval or modern times. Setting aside its consideration as a poetical and legendary attribute, there are tolerably authentic accounts, if not of the actual flight of man, of the imitation of the movements of birds in well-constructed automata.

Archytas had a wooden dove capable of flight, and Regiomontanus made a wooden eagle. These, however, are mere historical records, and there are not many definite plans left us until 1683, when Wilkens, Bishop of Chester, published his plans of an aërial chariot. From that time to the present hardly a year has passed without the appearance of some proposal, more or less visionary, to solve the problem of aërial navigation. But these proposals have only resulted in ignominious failure, sometimes fatal to the experimenter; and this is hardly a matter of wonder when we consider that, for long, little or nothing was known of the laws of gravitation and of the medium to be controlled. The methodical study of the laws of the natural flight of birds and insects has been neglected up to the present time. It is, then, hardly just to condemn the student of aëronautics as one needing friendly care, until a complete series of experiments, conducted according to the light of present science, shall have shown the futility of the idea of artificial flight.

Aërostation may be considered under two heads. 1. Ballooning, in which ascent is gained by means of a gas specifically lighter than air. 2. True flight, in which the acts of rising and suspension are due to expended force. There are two obvious reasons why balloons have not been successfully navigated. It is difficult to apply a directive force at the point of suspension of the balloon, while any force applied to the car merely serves to tilt the balloon. Again, a body to be propelled against a

current of air, even that created by its own motion, must have a weight in proportion to its surface. This law will become apparent in endeavouring to throw a block of wood and a cube of paper to the same distance. It was for long generally supposed that birds were suspended or balanced by a certain volume of rarefied air confined in the lungs, bones, and feathers. But this explanation will not bear the least reflection.

Mr. Charles Sinclair managed in 1872 to raise himself with great practical success some fifteen feet in the air without the assistance of a specifically lighter material. The plan of the machine consisted in fastening to the body of the aéronaut a series of parallel aéro-planes, somewhat similar to a set of shelves made of light frame-work, covered with canvas, and arranged at about two or three inches from each other. Running against the wind with these quasi-wings attached to his body, Mr. Sinclair, in his first experiment, found himself elevated a few feet, when one of the planes shifted, and he was violently hurled to the ground. The machine mended, with several improvements in its construction, he again essayed to attain some slight elevation, and, with a preliminary run of 100 feet, rose steadily in the air to a height of fifteen feet. This experiment would seem to point to some modification of a boy's kite as a means of elevation. Any one who has seen a Canadian ice-boat has observed how, at the slightest check, such as that afforded by a small block of ice, the vessel is raised by the force of the wind upon the sails, and carried over the impediment. Similarly, a boy runs with his kite to raise it; but we must seek some other means of imparting the required momentum, probably by the inclined plane for that afforded by running.

If ever the important problem of artificial flight is to be solved, it is reasonable to conclude that the same laws and forces which produce natural flight must be discovered and applied. Imbued with this belief, Dr. Pettigrew made a series of elaborate inquiries into the structure and function of natural wings, and the peculiar properties requisite in artificial wings to produce artificial flight. Dr. Pettigrew was engaged in these researches since 1865, and carefully analyzed, figured, and described, not only the movements of the wings of insects, bats, and birds, but he also examined in detail the movements of a large number of animals fitted for swimming, such as the otter, seal, sea-bear, walrus, penguin, turtle, crocodile, porpoise, fish, &c.

By comparing the flippers of the seal, sea-bear, and walrus with the fin and tail of the fish, and the wing of the penguin (a bird which is incapable of flight, and can only swim and dive) with the wing of the insect, bat, and bird, he was able to show that a close analogy exists between the flippers, fins, and tails of

sea mammals and fishes on the one hand, and the wings of insects, bats, and birds on the other ; in fact, that theoretically and practically these organs, one and all, form flexible helices or screws, which, in virtue of their rapid reciprocating action, operate upon the water and air after the manner of double inclined planes. In all ages men have envied the powers of flight possessed by birds, and from ancient to modern times inventors and schemers have busied their brains with devices intended to confer upon humanity the desirable effect of aërial locomotion. For the most part, such effects have been made by a class of projectors whose folly and infatuation have thrown ridicule upon the idea. Over and over again, the most absurd contrivances have been represented as sure to achieve success—a little more money was the only thing required ; and if a sympathizing public would only find the funds, blundering enthusiasts promised, and believed, that they would fly like jackdaws from the neighbouring steeple, or soar like eagles far above the haunts of men.

The establishment of an "Aëronautical Society" in this country in 1867, under the presidency of the Duke of Argyll, and with a council containing such men as Sir Charles Bright, William Fairbairn, and James Glaisher, has had the curious effect of raising expectations in scientific minds, that at last some form of flying apparatus may be made to succeed. Of late years, a partial study of the wings of birds, and of their methods of action, seem to show that flight was a physical impossibility to man. The size of the bird's wing was so large in proportion to the creature's weight, and it appeared to demand so great an amount of muscular force for its movements, that it seemed perfectly hopeless to expect that human muscles could wield an apparatus of the required dimensions, and with the velocities demanded, or that any mechanism could be constructed generating sufficient force in proportion to its weight. There has been exaggeration in the popular estimate of the force exerted in the operation of the very complicated and abstruse question, the flight of birds.

A weight of 150 pounds suspended from a surface of the same number of square feet will fall through the air at the rate of 1300 feet per minute, the force expended on the air being nearly six-horse power. Consequently, that power would be required to keep the same weight and surface suspended at a fixed altitude. A man can perform muscular work equal to raising his own weight, say 150 pounds, 22 feet per minute ; but at this low rate of speed he would require to sustain him on the air a surface of 120,000 square feet, making no allowance for weight beyond his body. Thus attempts to construct bird-like wings, by which a

man could raise himself perpendicularly, appear quite impracticable.

Some of the pelicans on the Nile, which weigh 21 pounds, and whose wings measure 10 feet from end to end, during their flight make about 70 wing-strokes per minute, and when they float on the air a few strokes in each minute appear sufficient to sustain them, and there is no symptom of powerful exertion. It has been noticed that flocks of spoonbills flying at about 30 miles an hour, at less than 15 inches above the Nile's surface, do not create a sufficient commotion in the air to ripple the surface of the water. It has also been remarked that an eagle, impelled to activity by a charge of large shot rattling amongst his feathers, runs at least 20 yards before he can raise himself from the ground. Many other observations of birds are highly important, and enable us to form some conception of the way in which various kinds of wings perform their work.

A gnat expends in flying much more force, proportionally, than an eagle. In some insects the motion of the wings is so rapid as to be quite invisible. Most of them produce whilst flying a more or less acute buzzing sound, the pitch of which may be ascertained by means of any musical instrument, and this should, it seems, give us the number of beats of the wing per second. This number is 330 for the common house-fly, 290 for the bee, 140 for the wasp, 70 for the common moth, 28 for the dragonfly, and about 8 for the common butterfly. These numbers represent the *double vibration*, *i.e.*, the rise and fall of the wing reckoned as one beat.

If a plane moves against the wind, or the wind against a plane, at the rate of 22 feet per second, 1320 feet per minute, or 15 miles an hour, a force of 1 pound per square foot is obtained. When a falling body having a weight of 1 pound to each foot of resisting surface reaches that velocity, the atmospheric resistance balances its weight, and keeps it from descending faster. A man and a parachute, weighing together 143 pounds, will not fall with a greater velocity if the parachute is kept in position, and has an area of 143 square feet. A fall of 8 feet brings a body to the earth with the same velocity, which is not sufficient to destroy life or limb. Swallows have a wing-surface of 2 square feet to the pound : some of the duck tribe which fly well little more than half a square foot, or 72 inches to the pound. If such birds allowed themselves to fall perpendicularly, with outstretched wings, they would reach the ground with an injurious velocity, but by descending obliquely they alight with ease and safety. This combination of a horizontal motion with a perpendicular one is of the greatest importance.

In the case of perpendicular descent, as a parachute, the sus-

taining effect will be much the same, whatever the figure of the outline of the superficies may be, and a circle affords, perhaps, the best resistance of any. Take, for example, a circle of 20 square feet (as possessed by the pelican) loaded with as many pounds. This, as just stated, will limit the rate of perpendicular descent to 1320 feet per minute. But instead of a circle 61 inches in diameter, if the area is bounded by a parallelogram 10 feet long by 2 broad, and whilst at perfect freedom to descend perpendicularly, let a force be applied exactly in a horizontal direction, so as to carry it edgeways, with the long side foremost, at a forward speed of 30 miles an hour—just double that of its passive descent—the rate of fall under these conditions will be decreased most remarkably, probably to less than one-fifteenth part, 88 feet per minute, or 1 mile per hour. This diminution of the descending velocity is occasioned by the resistance of the mass of air moved by the parachute in its horizontal course, and which necessarily becomes greater in proportion to the width of the parachute.

Among the experimental illustrations that have been suggested is the action of a thin blade, one inch wide and a foot long, fixed at right angles to a spindle on which it can be turned. If such an apparatus is immersed in a stream running in the direction of the spindle, and held at rest, the force which the blade has to resist will be simply that of the water-current acting on its surface, and the current will be checked to a corresponding extent. If, however, the spindle and blade are made to rotate rapidly the retarding effect against direct motion will now be increased over *tenfold*, and is equal to that due to the *entire area of the circle of revolution*. By trying the effect of blades of various widths it will be found that, for the purpose of effecting the maximum amount of resistance, the more rapidly the spindle revolves the narrower may be the blade.

It will be evident that if a column of air were rotating in the same direction, and with the same velocity as that of the vane and spindle, the movement of the vane would not be resisted by the air, and just to the extent to which the revolving vane communicates its own motion to the air, the reaction of the air against the motion of the vane will be lessened. If at each movement of its progress in a horizontal direction the vane acted upon a stratum of air whose *vis inertiae* had not been disturbed, the maximum of reaction would be obtained. In a very ingenious way these facts have been applied to the action of the long wings of swallows and other birds characterized by the length of their flying apparatus, to show the great mechanical disadvantage at which a bird or a machine must operate in order to raise a weight *perpendicularly*, as compared with raising it obliquely. It does

not appear that any large bird can raise itself perpendicularly in a still atmosphere, but pigeons can accomplish it approximately to a moderate height, and the humming-bird, by the extremely rapid vibration of its pinions, can sustain itself for one minute in still air in the same position—the muscular force required for this feat being much greater than for any other performance of flight. The wings uphold the weight, not by striking vertically downwards upon the air, but as inclined surfaces reciprocating horizontally like a screw, but wanting in its continuous rotation in one direction, and, therefore, with some loss of power from the rapid alternation of motion.

To rise from the ground, a bird must spring. Now, as their strength is nearly proportionate to their size, and as the quantity of work necessary to accomplish a bound of a given height is also proportionate to the weight, it follows that all birds, whatever their size, spring nearly to the same height. But the extent of spring accomplished by the smaller species is sufficient to enable them to flap their wings without bringing them into contact with the ground; this is not the case with larger birds, such as the eagle or the albatross, the latter is obliged to run for some distance along the ground before it can rise. When it has thus acquired a certain amount of horizontal velocity, it suddenly open its wings as if to soar, and the extended surface tends to counterbalance the effects of gravitation. It is, at this moment, that it springs, and rises at once to a sufficient height to flap its wings. Many large birds, such as the eagle and the condor, generally avoid settling on the ground, and remain perched on high rocks, from whence they can easily soar into space.

A bird is sustained in the air by the *weight* of that *fluid*, and the sustaining power of its wings will depend upon the quantity or weight of air that would have to be displaced by its fall. By a wide stretch of wing, and a horizontal motion, the resistance is maximized, and a long-winged bird that has raised itself in the air may avoid falling by maintaining a certain horizontal velocity with a moderate expenditure of force.

A kite is sustained and moved obliquely by the force of the wind and the weight of the air which its fall must displace. Thus, there is some analogy between a wing and a kite, it being mechanically pretty much the same thing whether a breeze blows against a resisting surface, or a resisting surface is moved against a mass of air. Captain Dansey, who made an experiment with a kite, having a surface of only 55 square feet, raised a weight of 92½ pounds in a strong breeze, and he considers that exploring kites might be safer and more convenient than exploring balloons for purposes of war, though their employment would be dependent on the force of the wind.

A thin stratum of air is displaced beneath the wings of a bird in rapid flight, and it follows that, in order to obtain the necessary *length* of plane for supporting heavy weights, the surfaces may be superposed, or placed in parallel rows, with an interval between them. A dozen pelicans may fly one above another without mutual impediment, as if framed together; and it is thus shown how two hundred weights may be supported in a transverse distance of only 10 feet.

Many facts discovered of late years in reference to the action of screws as substitutes for paddles in steam navigation, and in relation to the flight of various shaped projectiles, may come in aid of the aéronautist.

Since Professor Pettigrew enunciated his views (1867) as to the screw configuration and elastic properties of natural wings, and more especially since his introduction of *spiral-elastic artificial wings*, and *elastic screws*, a great revolution has taken place in the construction of flying models.

Elastic aéro-planes have been advocated by Mr. Brown, elastic aerial screws by M. Armour, and elastic aéro-planes, wings, and screws, by M. Pénaud.

The first suggestion known regarding the history of the screw as applied to the air was given by Paueton in 1768. This author, in his treatise on the "Théorie de la Vis d'Archiméde," describes a machine provided with two screws which he calls a "ptérophones." In 1796, Sir George Cayley gave a practical illustration of the efficacy of the screw as applied to the air by constructing a small machine, consisting of two screws made of quill feathers. Cayley's screws were peculiar, inasmuch as they were superimposed and rotated in opposite directions. He estimated that if the area of the screws was increased to 200 square feet, and moved by a man, they would elevate him.

Other experimenters followed Cayley at moderate intervals—Deghen in 1816, Ottoris Sarti in 1823, and Dubochet in 1834. These inventors all constructed flying models on the vertical screw principle. In 1842 Mr. Philips succeeded in elevating a steam model by the aid of revolving fans, which flew across two fields after having attained a great altitude; and in 1859 Mr. Bright took out a patent for a machine to be sustained by vertical screws, the model of which is to be seen at the Patent Museum, Kensington, London. In 1863 the subject of aviation by vertical screws received a fresh impulse from the experiments of MM. Ponton d'Amécourt, De la Landelle, and Nadar, who exhibited models driven by clock-work springs, which ascended with graduated weights a distance of from 10 to 12 feet. These models were so fragile that they usually broke in coming in contact with the ground in their descent. Their flight, more-

over, was unsatisfactory, from the fact that it only lasted a few seconds.

Stimulated by the success of his spring models, M. Ponton d'Amécourt had a small steam model constructed. This model, which was shown at the Exhibition of the Aëronautical Society of Great Britain at the Crystal Palace in 1868, consisted of two superposed screws propelled by an engine, the steam of which was generated (for lightness) in an aluminium boiler. This steam model proved a failure, inasmuch as it only lifted a third of its own weight.

Several other inventors succeeded in making models fly by the aid of aëroplanes and screws, as, *e.g.*, Mr. Stringfellow in 1847, M. du Temple in 1857, and M. Jullien in 1858.

Professor Marey endeavoured to construct an artificial insect on the plan advocated by Borelli in 1670, who was the first to give an account of artificial wings; but the professor signally failed.

MM. Villeneuve and Pénaud constructed their winged models on different types, the former selecting the bat, the latter the bird.

Mr. Stringfellow constructed a successful flying-machine in 1868 in which aëro-planes were combined with aërial-screws. This model was on view at the Exhibition of the Aëronautical Society of Great Britain, held at the Crystal Palace, London, in the above-mentioned year. It was remarkably compact, elegant and light, and obtained the £100 prize of the Exhibition for its engine, which was the lightest and most powerful ever constructed. M. de Lôme in 1872 proposed to remove seven out of the eight men employed to work the screw of his aërial ship, and substitute an engine of eight-horse power, with one man as engineer. The ballast was then to consist of the fuel and water, while the aërostat could be impelled at the rate of 14 miles an hour, at a much larger angle, with the plane of direction of the wind.

It is remarkable that previous to the invention of balloons, flying-machines were pet schemes with many philosophers.

If aërial navigation is ever to assume practical importance, it must be through the agency of some mechanism more manageable and less liable to derangement than an enormous bag filled with a material that has the greatest possible aptitude for escaping through the minutest pores.

A certain proposition in physics, known as the "Principle of Archimedes," runs to the following effect:—"Every body plunged into a liquid loses a portion of its weight equal to the weight of the fluid which it displaces." Every one has verified the principle, and knows that objects are much lighter in water than out of it; a body plunged into water being acted upon by

two forces—its own weight, which tends to sink it and resistance from below, which tends to bear it up. But this principle applies to gas as well as to liquids, to air, as well as to water. When we weigh a body in the air, we do not find its absolute weight, but that weight *minus* the weight of the air which the body displaces. In order to know the exact weight of an object, it would be necessary to weigh it in a vacuum. If an object thrown into the air is heavier than the air which it displaces, it descends, and falls upon the earth; if it is lighter, it rises until it comes to a stratum of air of less weight or density than itself. We all know, of course, that the higher you rise from the earth the density of the air diminishes. The stratum of air that lies upon the surface of the earth is the heaviest, because it supports the pressure of all the other strata that lie above. Thus, the lightest strata are the highest.

The principle of the construction of balloons is therefore in perfect harmony with physical laws. Balloons are simply globes, made of a light, air-tight material, filled with hot air or hydrogen gas, which rise in the air *because they are lighter than the air they displace.*

The application of this principle appeared so simple, that at the time when the news of the invention of the balloon was spread abroad the astronomer, Lalande, wrote:—"At this news we all cry, This must be!" "Why did we not think of it before?" It had been thought of before as I shall endeavour to show. Roger Bacon, writing in the thirteenth century, in his "Treaty of the Admirable Power of Art and Nature," puts forth the idea "that it is possible to make flying-machines in which the man being seated or suspended in the middle, might turn some winch or crank, which would put in motion a suit of wings made to strike the air like those of a bird."

In the same treatise he sketches a flying-machine, to which that of Blanchard, who lived in the eighteenth century, bears a certain resemblance. The monk, Roger Bacon, was worthy of entering the temple of fame before his great namesake the Lord Chancellor, who, in the seventeenth century, inaugurated the era of experimental science.

The scientific principle on which balloons are founded was exhibited at Edinburgh in 1767, by Dr. Black, Professor of Chemistry, who announced to his audience that a vessel filled with hydrogen gas would rise naturally into the air; it was tried in 1782, by Professor Cavallo, who filled soap bubbles with hydrogen gas, and saw them rise rapidly in the air on account of their specific lightness. From the labours of Lana and Galien, with their impossible flying-machines, the inventor of the balloon could derive no benefit whatever; nor is his fame to be in the

least diminished because many had laboured in the same field before him. Nor can the story of the *Ovoador*, or flying-man, a legend very confused, and of which there are many versions, have given to Montgolfier any valuable hints. The first balloon, Montgolfier's, was simply filled with hot air; and it was because Montgolfier exclusively made use of hot air that balloons so filled were named Montgolfiers. Of course, we see at a glance that hot air is lighter than cold air, because it has become expanded, and occupies more space—that is to say, a volume of hot air contains actually less air than a volume of the same size of air that has not been heated. The difference between the weight of the hot air and the cold which it displaces is greater than the weight of the covering of the balloon. Therefore the balloon mounts. And, seeing that air diminishes in density the higher we ascend, the balloon can rise only to that stratum of air of the same density as the air it contains. As the warm air cools it gently descends. Again, as the atmosphere is always moving in currents more or less strong, the balloon follows the direction of the current of the stratum of air in which it finds itself. Thus, we see how simply the ascent of Montgolfiers and their motions are explained. It is the same with gas balloons. A balloon, filled with hydrogen gas, displaces an equal number of atmospheric air; but as the gas is much lighter than the air, it is pushed up by a force equal to the difference of the density of air and hydrogen gas. The balloon then rises in the atmosphere to where it reaches layers of air of a density exactly equal to its own, and when it gets there remains poised in its place. In order that it may descend, it is necessary to let out a portion of the hydrogen gas, and admit an equal quantity of atmospheric air; and the balloon does not come to the ground till all, or nearly all, the gas has been expelled and common air taken in.

Balloons inflated with hydrogen gas are almost the only ones in use at the present day. Scarcely ever is a Montgolfier sent up. There are aéronauts, however, who prefer a journey in a Montgolfier to one in a gas-balloon. The air-voyager in this description of balloon had many difficulties to contend with. The quantity of combustible material which he was bound to carry with him; the very little difference there is between the density of heated and cold air; the necessity of feeding the fire and watching it without a moment's cessation, as it hangs in the réchaud over the middle of the car, rendered this sort of air-travelling subject to many dangers and difficulties. M. Eugène Godard obviated a portion of this difficulty by fitting a chimney, like that which is found of such incalculable service in the case of the Davy lamp. It is principally on account of this improvement that Montgolfier rose so highly in popular esteem.

Generally, it is not pure hydrogen that is made use of in the inflation of balloons. Aéronauts content themselves with the gas which we burn in our streets and houses, and thus it suffices, in inflating the balloon, to obtain from the nearest gas-works the quantity of gas necessary, and to lead it, by means of a pipe or tube, from the gasometer to the mouth or neck of the machine.

The idea of the valve, as well as that of the sand ballast, is due to the physician Charles. They enable the aéronaut to ascend or descend with facility. When he wishes to mount, he throws over his ballast; when he wants to come down, he lets the gas escape by the valve at the roof of the balloon. This valve is worked by means of a spring, having a long rope attached to it, which hangs down through the neck to the car, where the aéronaut sits. An ordinary balloon, with a lifting power sufficient to carry up three persons, with necessary ballast and *material*, is about 50 feet high, 35 feet in diameter, and 2250 cubic feet in capacity. Of such a balloon the accessories—the skin, the network, the car—would weigh about 335 lbs. To find out the height at which he has arrived, the aéronaut consults his barometer. We know that it is the pressure of the air up the cup of the barometer that raises the mercury in the tube. The heavier the air is the higher is the barometer. At the level of the sea the column of mercury stands at 32 inches; at 3250 feet—the air being at this elevation lighter—the mercury stands at 28 inches; at 6500 feet above sea level it stands at 25 inches; at 10,000 feet it falls to 22 inches; at 20,000 feet to 15 inches. These, however, are merely the theoretic results, and are subject to some slight variation, according to the locality, &c. Sometimes the aéronaut makes his descent by means of the parachute, a separate and distinct contrivance. If, from any cause, it appears impracticable to effect a descent from the balloon itself, the parachute may be of the greatest service to the voyager. At the present day it is only used to astonish the public, by showing them the spectacle of a man who, from a great elevation in the air, precipitates himself into space, not to escape dangers which threaten him in his balloon, but simply to exhibit his courage and skill. Nevertheless, parachutes are often of great actual use, and aéronauts frequently attach them to their balloons as a precautionary measure before setting out on an aërial excursion. The shape of a parachute very much resembles that of the well-known and serviceable umbrella.

The virtues of the parachute were first tried upon animals. Thus, Blanchard allowed his dog to fall in one from a height of 6500 feet. A gust of wind caught the falling parachute and

swept it away up above the clouds. Afterwards, the aëronaut in his balloon fell in with the dog in the parachute, both of them high up in the cloudy reaches of the sky ; and the poor animal manifested by his barking his joy at seeing his master. A new current separated the aërial voyagers ; but the parachute, with its canine passenger, reached the ground safely a short time after Blanchard had landed from his balloon.

Experience has proved that, in the case of a descending parachute, if the rapidity of the descent is doubled the resistance of the air is quadrupled; if the rapidity is triple, the resistance is increased ninefold ; or, to speak in the language of science, the resistance of the air is increased by the square of the swiftness of the body in motion. This resistance increases in proportion as the parachute spreads, and thus the uniformity of its fall is established a minute after it has been disengaged from the balloon. We can therefore check the descent of a body by giving it a surface capable of distension by the action of the air.

Garnerin, in the year 1802, conceived the bold design of letting himself fall from a height of 1200 feet, and he accomplished the exploit before the Parisians. When he had reached the height he had fixed beforehand, he cut the rope which connected the parachute with the balloon. At first the fall was terribly rapid, but as soon as the parachute spread out the rapidity was considerably diminished. The machine made, however, enormous oscillations. The air, gathering and compressed under it, would sometimes escape by one side, sometimes by the other, thus shaking and whirling the parachute about with a violence which, however great, had happily no unfortunate effect.

The origin of the parachute is more remote than is generally supposed, as there was a figure of one which appeared among a collection of machines at Venice in 1617.

The most extravagant balloon project was that of Robertson, who published a scheme for making a tour of the world. He called it "La Minerva," an aërial vessel destined for discoveries, and proposed to all the Academies of Europe, by Robertson, Physicist (Vienna, 1804; reprinted at Paris, 1820).

Robertson's proposed machine was to be 150 feet in diameter, and would be capable of carrying 150,000 pounds. Every precaution was to be taken in order to make this great structure perfect. It was to accommodate sixty persons, to be chosen by the Academies, who should stay in it for several months, should rise to all possible elevations, pass through all climates in all seasons, make scientific observations, &c. This balloon, which was to penetrate deserts inaccessible by other means of travel, and visit places which travellers had never penetrated, was to be of immense use in the science of geography, and when under the Line, if the

heat near the earth should be inconvenient, the aéronauts would, of course, easily rise to elevations where the temperature is equal and agreeable. When their observations, their needs, or their pleasures demanded it, they could descend to within a short distance of the earth—say 90 feet—and fix themselves in their position by means of an anchor. The immensity of the seas seemed to be the only source of insurmountable difficulties.

But [says Robertson] over what a vast space might not one travel in six months with a balloon fully furnished with the necessities of life and all the appliances necessary for safety? Besides, if, through the natural imperfection attaching to all the works of man, or either through accident or age, the balloon, borne above the sea, became incapable of sustaining the travellers, it is provided with a boat, which can withstand the waters and guarantee the return of the voyagers.

It is probable that at the origin of navigation, man, before he had invented oars and sails, made use of trunks of trees upon which he trusted himself, leaving the rest to the winds and the currents of the water, whether these were known or unknown. There is some analogy between such rude rafts, the first discovered means of navigation on water, and balloons, the first discovered means of navigation in air. But unquestionably the advantage is with the latter.

No means have yet been found of directly steering balloons, but by allowing the gas to escape the aéronaut can descend at will, and by lightening his car of part of the ballast he carries he can ascend as readily. It must also be remembered that the currents of air vary in their directions, according to their elevation, and were the aéronaut perfectly acquainted with aerial currents, he might, by raising or lowering himself, find a wind blowing in the direction in which he wished to proceed, and the last problem of aërostation would be solved. That any such knowledge can ever be acquired it is impossible to say; but this much may with safety be advanced, that distant journeys may frequently be taken by balloons for useful purposes.

One of the most remarkable excursions of this kind was that superintended by Green, in 1836, from London to Germany. This journey, 1200 miles in length, is the longest that has yet been accomplished. Mr. Green was the first who substituted common coal gas for hydrogen as an inflating medium, thereby effecting a great saving of cost.

A vast amount of ingenuity has been expended upon ballooning with an almost profitless result. Mr. Green made an attempt to control and regulate the course of a balloon. He devised a form of windmill, which he placed in front of the machine, to react to an aerial current having the direction it was desired to take.

M. Trauson invented an *aëronef*, or air-ship, consisting of two balloons attached to each other by a cable. The velocity was regulated by means of sails.

In 1840 Messrs. Ramwell and Marsh conceived a complicated machine, in which twenty small balloons were attached to a light frame-work.

M. Eubriot invented an oblong balloon with sails attached to the car.

None of these experiments, however, achieved any practically useful result.

In 1844 M. Monge constructed, at Paris, a copper balloon.

In the construction of balloons experts have proposed various shapes time after time, *e.g.*, that of the egg, the fish, the fan, and the kite.

In 1853 Lord Carlingford placed in the Dublin Exhibition a model of his "Archedon," or aërial chariot. It was formed of a boat with a wheel in front and two behind ; at the sides were a couple of concave wings ; there was also a tail.

In 1856 a model of an "Archimedean balloon" was exhibited, in which a variety of ingenious appliances were combined ; the balloon itself was of cylindrical form, with hemispherical ends ; there were paddles to give it a progressive motion, there was a screw to steer it, there was a chemical engine to supply it with motive power ; but the project has never been carried out.

The energetic Parisian photographer, M. Nadar, may assert his claim as the inventor of the largest aërial machine which up to this period has ever ascended into the upper air. The monster machine made its first ascent on October 4th, 1863, the somewhat approximate name of "Le Géant" being given to it. This balloon was remarkable as having attached to it a regular two-story house for a car. Its ascent was witnessed by nearly half a million of persons. The balloon, after passing over the eastern part of France, Belgium, and Hanover, suffered a disastrous descent in the latter country, the day after it had started on its perilous journey. The expenses of the construction of the balloon amounted, directly and indirectly, to the sum of £8300. Its two ascents in Paris and its exhibition in London produced only £3300.

M. Babinet, speaking on the subject of aërial locomotion before the French Polytechnic Association three or four years ago, said :—

I bought a plaything, very much in vogue at that time, called a Stropheor. This toy was composed of a small rotating screw propeller, which revolved on its own support when the piece of string wound round it was pulled sharply. The screw was rather heavy, weighing nearly a quarter of a pound ; and the wings were of tin, very

broad and thick. This machine, however, was rather too eccentric for parlour use, for its flight was so violent that it was continually breaking the pier glass, if there was one in the room ; and, failing this, it next attacked the windows. The ascending force of this machine is so great that I have seen one of them fly over Antwerp Cathedral, which is one of the highest edifices in the world. The air from beneath the machine is exhausted by the action of the screw, which, passing under the wings, causes a vacuum, while the air above it replenishes and fills this void ; and under the influence of these two causes the apparatus mounts from the earth. But the problem is not solved by means of this plaything, whose motive power is exterior to it. Messrs. Nadar, Ponton d'Amécourt, and De La Landelle teach us better than this, although the wings of their different models are entirely unworthy of men who desire to demonstrate a truth to short-lived mortals. We have only arrived as yet at the infancy of the process ; but we have made a good beginning, for, having once proved that a machine capable of raising itself in the air, wholly unaided from without, can be made, we have overcome with this apparently small result the whole difficulty.

It is to Mr. Glaisher and Mr. Coxwell, however, that the highest honours of scientific aërostation belong. The ascents made by these gentlemen—Mr. Glaisher being the scientific observer, and Mr. Coxwell the practical aéronaut—have become matters of history. Not only did they, in the course of a large number of ascents undertaken under the auspices of the British Association, succeed in gathering much valuable meteorological information, but they reached a greater height than that ever gained on any previous or subsequent occasion, and penetrated into that distant region of the skies in which it has been satisfactorily proved that no life can be long sustained.

It was on September 5, 1862, that Mr. Glaisher and Mr. Coxwell made their famous ascent, in which they reached the greatest height, viz., seven miles, ever attained by any aéronaut, and were so nearly sacrificed to their unselfish daring.

In this ascent six pigeons were taken up. One was thrown out at the height of three miles, when it extended its wings and dropped like a piece of paper ; the second, at four miles, flew vigorously round and round, apparently taking a dip each time ; a third was thrown out between four and five miles, and it fell downwards as a stone. A fourth was thrown out at four miles on, flew in a circle, and shortly alighted on the top of the balloon. The remaining two pigeons were brought down to the ground.

The number of pulsations [says Mr. Glaisher] is usually increased with elevation, as also the number of inspirations ; the number of my pulsations was generally 76 per minute before starting, about 90 at 10,000 feet, 100 at 20,000 feet, and 110 at higher elevations ; but the increase of height was not the only element, for the

number of pulsations depended also on the health of the individual. They also, of course, varied in different persons, depending much on their temperament. This was the case, too, in respect to colour—at 10,000 feet the face of some would be of a glowing purple, whilst others would scarcely be effected. At 17,000 feet my lips were blue; at 19,000 feet both my hands and lips were dark blue; at four miles high the pulsations of my heart were audible, and my breathing was very much effected; at 29,000 feet I became insensible.

According to Mr. Glaisher the perfect stillness of the region six miles from the earth is such that no sound reaches the ear.

In the propagation of sound Mr. Glaisher made many curious experiments. In one ascent he found, when at a distance of 11,800 feet above the earth, that a band was heard; at a height of 22,000 feet a clap of thunder was heard; and at a height of 10,070 feet the report of a gun was heard. On one occasion he heard the dull hum of London at a height of 9000 feet above the city, and on another occasion the shouting of many thousands of persons could not be heard at the height of 4000 feet.

Scarcely had the first ascents astonished the world than the more adventurous spirits began to use the new discovery for a thousand purposes directly useful to man. The first point of view in which aërostation was regarded was in that of its practical utility. In 1794 the Committee of Public Safety employed balloons in the observation of the forces and the movements of hostile troops, and the French armies were provided with two companies of aéronauts.

In the disastrous Franco-Prussian War—1870-72—balloons again played an important part—notably during the siege of Paris, when no less than fifty-four balloons left that city between September 20, 1870, and January 28, 1871, charged with letters and despatches; the letters thus transported being about 2,500,000 in number, and weighing altogether about ten tons. Besides this freight about a hundred persons were conveyed from Paris by these Postal balloons. Unfortunately, the return of these aerial messengers could not be effected, the route followed by them being at the will of the wind. One of them, "La Ville d'Orléans," came down in Norway; two or three, indeed, were lost, probably in the sea.

ANDREW T. SIBBALD.

**ART. VII.—MR. GLADSTONE AND BLESSED JOHN FISHER.**

WE are grateful to Mr. Gladstone for giving us a patient hearing. Too often Catholics complain of injustice or answer an accusation without effect, because they meet with no attention. Even in historical matters, and in questions of fact, prejudice has been so strong that we hardly succeed in obtaining a hearing, or nothing but a superficial one at best. This naturally is the case when conclusions are at stake, more or less affected by the facts under discussion ; and practically men too often say *tant pis pour les faits*, when the facts are not what their conclusions require. The “continuity” of the Church of England is one of those cherished conclusions. That the Established Church of the present day is the lineal descendant of the Church of St. Augustine, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and of Warham, and Fisher and More, is maintained by many members of the Established Church, whose sympathies are with the saints and martyrs of the old time rather than with Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth. The truth of this theory or its falsehood does not depend solely on historical facts, but also upon doctrines, and the doctrines are more certain and more conclusive than any facts that can be alleged ; but the truth of statements respecting the facts is very interesting and extremely important. Mr. Gladstone has recognized the value of the doctrines involved, and has himself fairly stated the theological propositions which, if established, would neutralize his historical inquiry. We quoted them from his pages in our former article on this subject.\* They amount to this, that the changes of doctrine, of rite, and of law, that took place at the Reformation, each of them touched essentials of the true Church, so that the religious body that existed after such changes could not be regarded as the very same as the Church that had all those essentials untouched. It was fair of Mr. Gladstone to acknowledge the predominance of doctrine in the solution of the question ; and an indication of an honest intention to seek for truth is manifest in all that he has written on the subject. If we, or any other Catholic writer, have used a hard word about him, it is because under these circumstances it is trying to human nature to see an honest mind, with a share of acuteness that belongs to few men in the world, fall a victim to its own subtlety, and miss the truth when close

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1888, p. 245.

to it. For argument's sake saying *transeat* to the three theological propositions that really govern the position, Mr. Gladstone, in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1888, maintained that, as a matter of fact, a "basis of legality in its determining conditions for the proceedings of the Reformation" was established, not by Cranmer and the reforming prelates, but by Warham and Tunstall and Gardiner and Fisher. We joined issue with Mr. Gladstone, and, in our article already referred to, we disputed this alleged fact, and many assertions made by him in his attempt to establish it. In the *Nineteenth Century* for last November Mr. Gladstone has returned to the subject, and while endeavouring to justify the position he had assumed, he has shown a spirit of fairness and openness to conviction that induces us to hope that it may be possible for once thoroughly to thrash out a controverted point in history, so that an agreement may be come to for the future. In saying this we are not putting forward ourselves. So much has been said in reply to Mr. Gladstone's second article by writers in the *Tablet* and in the *Month*, that we, whose periodical time of publication has delayed our answer to the arguments particularly addressed to us by Mr. Gladstone, have our work rendered comparatively easy for us by the welcome fact that we follow Father Bridgett and Father Sydney Smith, Mr. Gillow and Dr. St. George Mivart.

An obvious consideration suggests itself at the outset. If Mr. Gladstone proved his contention, it would make no important difference except to individual reputations. One of the recent writers spoke of this as a "charge against Blessed John Fisher." In the *Tablet* of November 16 we find a note from Mr. Gladstone, who says: "I am sorry for the title given, probably by inadvertence, to the article. I intended no charge, but simply quoted a history." To a Protestant it is no charge, that is to say, nothing in a man's disfavour, that he broke with the Pope, and helped to establish Protestantism on a "basis of legality." It is only natural that a Catholic should account it a heavy charge against a man who is especially honoured for his constancy in maintaining the Pope's prerogatives, and by him the word certainly would not be used inadvertently. But apart from the personal honour or dishonour of the personages named, what real difference does it make whether the first Protestants were Cranmer and Lee, or Warham and Fisher? If the history quoted by Mr. Gladstone were proved to be true, it would not establish the continuity of the Church of England. It would simply change the place of the breach of that continuity. Heresy and schism would be no less heresy and schism in Warham and Fisher than in Cranmer and Lee, and the fact of good men going wrong would

not make their wrong right. This is not begging the question, but recognizing the difference between the theological propositions and the point of history. It is only saying that the point of history by itself is absolutely valueless towards establishing the identity of Anglicanism and the old religion. Turn the great prelates just spoken of into Protestants, and they are themselves then broken off from those who preceded them. Cranmer asked the Pope for his pallium, and received it after taking the oath that Archbishops of Canterbury were accustomed to take. So far the continuity was not broken, whatever Cranmer's intentions might have been. But the men who first renounced the Pope, whoever they were, broke the continuity, and introduced a new religion instead of the old. Whether they were right or wrong is not the point. Even if the old Church were wrong and the new one right, the continuity was broken, because an essential and radical change was brought in.

But though it cannot materially affect the question of continuity, whether the change was effected by these bishops or by those, it would undoubtedly be a powerful weapon in the hand of the controversialist who maintains that the change was from bad to good, from wrong to right, if he can show that the best men took part in the change, and took upon themselves to lay a "basis of legality" for the new system. Is it so, then? Mr. Gladstone's claim was that, while "a cloud of misrepresentation had, down to a recent period, overlain the facts," he had made a discovery, making Warham and Fisher the real authors of the Reformation. We examined this alleged discovery at the time, and Mr. Gladstone, proposing to himself to substantiate the position he had taken up, and to reply to our strictures, has published the second article with which we are now occupied. An important portion of that article discusses a passage that Mr. Gladstone very naturally thought was from a book by Sander; and we cannot help believing that, if Mr. Gladstone had known then, as he knows now, that Sander is not responsible for a word of it, he would not have written his second article at all. Respecting the passage thus quoted by him, Mr. Gladstone has shown himself to be honourably open to conviction, and his interest in the answers that have been made to him has appeared by the four letters that he has successively written to the *Tablet* newspaper, each one more satisfactory than the one before. The passage in question has been made memorable by this discussion, and though Mr. Gladstone defends it no longer, it will be useful that a record of it should be found in the pages of the *DUBLIN REVIEW*.

Mr. Gladstone, then, in his second article, sets himself to deal  
VOL. XXIII.—NO. I. [Third Series.]

First, with one serious charge of inaccuracy brought by Mr. Morris, S.J. It relates to Fisher, and the oath exacted under the Succession Act; and my statement [in p. 8] has led Mr. Morris to assert that Fisher never took any such oath, and that in support of the contrary allegation, there is not a corroborating word in Sander's book on the "Schism" (p. 883).

The reference is here to our former article in this REVIEW, and it is but right that we should acknowledge that we ought not to have said that "a corroborative word could not be found in Sander." It was not exactly that that we meant to say. There were three references given by Mr. Gladstone, one to Burnet, and the other two to Sander, and to "The Letters and Papers." Unfortunately, those references were not intelligible. The passages so referred to, "could not be found." Mr. Gladstone has now given his reference to Sander in a full and perfectly intelligible form, and if that be Sander, the corroborative word is there. It was perfectly right for Mr. Gladstone to say, that as he did not find the words he quoted, nor twelve consecutive pages that relate to them, translated with the rest of Sander's book by Mr. David Lewis, "some explanation appears to be required." The explanation has been given, and Mr. Lewis is fully acquitted of any charge of mutilating his author. As Mr. Joseph Gillow showed in a letter in the *Tablet*, and as was also shown in the *Tablet's* editorial columns, the words in question, and indeed the twelve pages, do not exist in the first edition of the book that passes under Sander's name, and were therefore not included in Mr. Lewis's translation, which is faithful throughout to the first edition.

Mr. Gillow has distinctly shown that the second and subsequent editions of Sander, though published under that name, first in Rome, and then in various places on the Continent, are in reality a different work from the first edition. Sander died in 1581. Rishton published the first edition of his book on the "Schism" in 1585; in that year Rishton died, and it would seem that he did not see the whole book through the press, as it mentions the martyrdom of Aldfield and Webley, which was in July of that year, whereas he died in June, on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul.\* Besides the mention of these martyrs which Mr. Gillow has noticed, we may point to the account of the banishment of thirty priests and two laymen on the 24th of

---

\* "Douay Diary," p. 206. Mr. Lewis supposes that Rishton may have lived into the year 1586, as the occurrences in the book occur after the date assigned for his death in June, 1585. But we feel bound to accept as conclusive the entry in the "Douay Diary," which is in the handwriting of the President, Dr. Thomas Worthington.

September, some of whom reached Rheims on the 8th of October. This throws the publication of the first edition to a date still later after Rishton's death ; and before his death his time for preparing it was very short. He was one of a former company of twenty priests, who were banished on the 31st of January in that same year, 1585, N.S. "At last," he says, "by the help of God, we landed at Boulogne, and having said farewell to those who brought us thither, we departed for different towns in France, each one according to his means. At last, we all came to Rheims, finding our brethren or our superiors in great distress about us in every place to which we came." The date of Rishton's arrival at Rheims was the 3rd of March; he then went to Paris, and afterwards to Pont-à-Mousson, and as we have seen, he died on the 29th of June, which gives less than four months for a man, whose end was probably hastened by the hardships of his imprisonment, to spend on the editing of his book. As to the printing, we may conclude, with Mr. Gillow, that "the work was either printed by Stephen Vallenger at Cologne, or by George Flinton and Stephen Brinkley, at the press which was set up at Rouen, with the assistance of Father Robert Persons, S.J." The proofs could not have been sent from Cologne or Rouen in time for Rishton to have corrected them before his death; but this work was evidently not done or intended to be done by himself, for he says that he sent his book, together with his letter to the reader, "to his friend Dr. Jodocus, to be transmitted by him to the bookseller, who so much wished to have it, with the single request that he would have it correctly printed, which he hoped would be done."\* That the book was really printed at Cologne, according to its imprint "Coloniæ Agrippinæ," is rendered more probable by this mention of his "very old friend, Jodocus Skarnkert, of Cologne," whom he had known also at Rome, and with whom he often had spoken of such books as this, both being interested in ecclesiastical history. One feels inclined to conjecture that Dr. Jodocus Skarnkert, of Cologne, is another name for some Englishman to whom he does not wish to draw the attention of Elizabeth's Ministers, perhaps for Richard Verstegan, who may have lived at Cologne, as Mr. Gillow says, helping Vallenger to publish Catholic books, before he made Antwerp his headquarters.

Rishton's book was published before the end of the year in which he died. Most probably, with the exception of the insertions we have spoken of in its concluding pages, this edition is all as it left his hands; but if he is responsible for the first

\* "Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism," translated by David Lewis' M.A., London, 1877, p. cxliii.

edition, the re-written book which was published under his name in Rome in the following year, avowedly *locupletius*, and subsequently edited and re-edited, we must not, in the same sense, call his. That Rishton managed to write the Appendix or fourth book, "On the Persecution under Elizabeth," which Mr. Lewis attributes entirely to his pen, is remarkable. His "Diary of Things Done in the Tower" begins in June, 1580, and this we must suppose to be the date of his own incarceration.\* At any rate it was before December, when it is mentioned in the "Douay Diary" as having happened with others in that year. Now he only left the Tower on his forcible banishment in January 1585, and what he wrote respecting the arrival in England of Father Persons and Blessed Edmund Campion, and all the twelve chapters of the fourth book must have been written between his banishment and his speedy death. As this fourth book is not voluminous and does not give many details, this is quite possible, but the time is short for all this work for a man in ill-health and wandering from place to place.

If it is necessary to say that the first edition alone is to be accepted as Rishton's, we have to add that it is, as yet, impossible to say with certainty how much of the first edition is Sander's. Rishton says that he "corrected certain passages which were faulty, either because the transcribers were careless, or not clearly expressed, because the author was in a hurry. He also left out some of the discussions which seemed tedious, in order to preserve more closely the order of the story, adding much, especially those things that took place after the death of Dr. Sander."† Unfortunately we have no immediate means of confronting the book with any manuscript of the book written by Sander. The only manuscript known to exist, claiming to be the work of Sander, is one in the English College at Rome,‡ and until this shall be published or carefully collated, we shall not be able to say how much that is attributed to Sander is his and not Rishton's. It contains the commencement by Sander of a fourth book, which was unknown to Rishton, who only speaks of three. But though the three books by Sander have certainly been changed by Rishton, and we have as yet no means of ascertaining in what those changes consist, there is nothing in this to shake our faith in the historical value of the book as published by Rishton. We know whom we are dealing with, and our authority is either Rishton or Sander,

\* Yet Cardinal Allen speaks of him as in the Gatehouse in June 1581. Allen's "Letters," p. 96. He was taken from the Tower to be tried with B. Edmund Campion in November 1580.

† "Rise and Growth," Lewis, p. cxliii.

‡ We have been informed by letter that the passage quoted by Mr. Gladstone cannot be found in it.

both of them admirable witnesses to fact, intelligent, careful, and accurate men ; and if the result is quoted as Sander, which in the first three books it most probably is, no harm is done. But it is quite another thing with the subsequent editions. We have first to ascertain whether our quotation is contained in the first edition, and here Mr. Lewis's translation is invaluable ; for if it be not there, we have neither Sander nor Rishton as our authority, and we have but the word of an unknown writer to trust to, without even certain knowledge of the editor who made the insertion. Mr. Gladstone is perfectly justified in saying that "the effect upon the Sander we hold in our own hands, of whatever edition, is serious," if in "whatever edition" he does not include the first. Its authority is quite unaffected by what has been written, and remains exactly where it was ; for Rishton's statement, that he had to some extent altered Sander's work, was published with it and has always been known. But if any one should hereafter quote from the later editions, he must be careful to compare with the first edition before he does what Mr. Gladstone did, and attribute his quotation to Sander.

We now come to the passage quoted by Mr. Gladstone—very pardonably, of course—as written by Sander, but which in reality is not to be found in Rishton's edition of Sander's book. It is quoted by Mr. Gladstone in Latin, and the *Tablet* gives the passage in English. We have slightly modified that translation :—

Induced and deceived by these and many other reasons, the Bishop of Rochester (who afterwards continually and vehemently bewailed his conduct) thought it necessary to yield to the necessity of the times, and persuaded the other bishops, who were as yet more firm in Christ [than the rest] (for most had already given in their adherence to Cranmer and Lee, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York respectively, who were both promoters of the King's affair), to swear, at least with the aforesaid limitation (as far as the Word of God permits), obedience to the King in ecclesiastical and spiritual causes. For this deed the Bishop of Rochester was afterwards so full of remorse that he publicly accused himself, and said that it had been his duty as a bishop to have taught others what the Word of God permitted or forbade, and this, not with an ambiguous exception, but in plain and express words, so that others might be prevented from falling into the trap. Nor did he ever consider that his sin had been sufficiently expiated until he had washed out its stain with his blood.

The question naturally arises, Where did the Roman editor of Rishton's book find his authority for this passage and its context ? It was published, it must be remembered, in 1586—that is to say, half a century after the time of which it is treating—and it was written in a foreign country. Father Bridgett's suggestion is that the editor had before him a narrative, of which no complete

copy is now known to exist, written by Richard Hilliard, who was in the household of Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, and therefore was a contemporary of Blessed John Fisher. The Roman writer was not only not unfriendly to the memory of the Bishop of Rochester, but regarded him as a great and holy martyr. He will then have admitted into his pages nothing injurious to his character, unless he thought himself bound by his love of historical truth to do so. He must, in consequence, have had before him some statement the authority of which he accounted not to be open to doubt. Hilliard's book was written while Cranmer was yet alive, that is, before 1555, and apparently whilst he was still in power,\* that is to say, before the accession of Mary in 1553.

The last we hear of Hilliard himself is that he went to Rome, and his manuscript history would therefore very naturally be found in Rome. Father Gasquet twice says that the Roman editor of Rishton in 1586 quotes Hilliard,† and nothing was more natural than that he should do so. That he did so in the present case is proved by Father Bridgett. We have fortunately a fragment of Hilliard's work among the Arundel manuscripts in the British Museum, and it contains the very passage that the Roman editor of 1586 must have had under his eyes. It must not be said that perhaps Hilliard is a second and independent authority. The proof that he is the source from which the Roman editor drew his statement consists in the anachronisms which are the same in both. It is not possible that two writers can independently have fallen into the same errors; and those errors, while they limit the statement to one author, are, at the same time, his confutation. Father Bridgett's summary of Hilliard we must give, and the reader will see for himself that the anachronisms in it would fully account for the similar errors in the passage from the Roman edition of Sander quoted by Mr. Gladstone, if the writer had Hilliard before him:—

I have no space for extracts, but I may say that there are many

---

\* In demortui Cantuariensis Præsulis locum, hominem Lutheranæ factionis facile principem Thomam Cranmerum collocant, qui non solum eorum institutum sua auctoritate promoverat, verum etiam litteris et doctrina, ut non est ineruditus, partes eorum defendebat, id quod sanctissime illis promisit, et bonâ fide in hunc usque diem præstitit.—Arundel MS. 152; Harl. 7047.

† "His work must have been in the hands of those who put forth the Roman edition of Sanders, 1586 (see p. 188)," "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries," vol. i. p. 295, note. "The later editions of Sanders' 'Schism' (e.g., 1590, p. 167), also give a quotation from his account of the destruction of the monasteries." *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 314, note. This refers to a long extract, called in the margin *Richardi Hilliardi de Henrico sacrilegio querela*. In the text he is called *vir quidam doctus ac pius qui sacrilegio interfuerat*. The Roman editor, therefore, knew Hilliard's book and quoted from it.

parallelisms between the two narratives, and especially that Hillyard, in spite of being a contemporary, has the very same anachronisms. He is even more confused. The outline of his narrative is as follows:—After the final sentence of the Pope in favour of Henry's first marriage, the King is filled with fury, and determined to be revenged (*Post sententiae promulgationem*, would indicate at the earliest, April, 1534). Evil counsellors urge him on to plunder the clergy. This plan is made more easy by the death of Wolsey and Warham; so they get the sees filled up by Crammer and Lee. More resigns his chancellorship, and Audley takes his place. Under him the affair begins. *Sub cuius magistratus initium incepit est fabula.* The courtiers are encouraged to speak vilely of the Pope, and Lutheran books against the Pope are publicly sold. Then a Parliament is summoned, and simultaneously the clergy meet in Convocation. The King addresses them, recounts his great benefits; dangerous times, he says, are at hand, let the clergy make him their friend, and recognize him as Head of the Anglican Church. There is an almost unanimous refusal; but the King and his agents gain over Fisher, and he, with the Bishop of Bath, persuade the rest to yield a little to the storm, and give the title with a saving clause. Alas, this has been the fountain of all evils. Afterwards, in Parliament, the title was granted to the King without the clause, all the bishops dissenting, but all the abbots voting for it. When Fisher was informed, he became speechless with grief, but his tears spoke for him—*lachrymis se impiorum fraudibus deceptum testabatur.* That this decree might have greater force, an oath was exacted with a prescribed form of words rejecting the authority of the Pope, and affirming that of the King, &c.

The reader, who bears in mind the true sequence of events, will see that all is here in confusion. An event of 1531 is made to follow one of 1534, and to be its effect. Crammer and Lee and Audley are the King's agents in the Convocation which affirmed the King's headship, whereas in truth Warham was still Archbishop, More Chancellor, and the See of York was vacant. It is clear that Dr. Hillyard's memory as regards dates was defective. He was not present in the southern convocation, and when the King alleged Fisher's subscription to the title in opposition to Tunstal's protest, the chaplain may easily have taken his Bishop's side at the time and felt indignant against Fisher; and, as time went on, and the evils developed, he may have come to trace them all back to Fisher's action (which he had never understood). The story of Fisher's tears and regret when it reached him would have confirmed these thoughts and caused him to write as he did.—(*Tablet*, November 23, 1889.)

The witness has broken down under cross-examination. He is friendly and desires to tell the truth and nothing but the truth; but he is hopelessly confused. That there is a foundation for what he says, we may be sure; but it is plain that it would be rash and uncritical to accept his evidence, as it stands, on a point where he is entirely without support. He has mis-

led the Roman editor of Rishton, but we must not let him mislead us also.

Besides this, Father Bridgett has shown that he does not say what Mr. Gladstone makes him say. The oath of succession rejected every "foreign authority or potentate," and declared "vain and annichilate" all oaths taken to him. If Bishop Fisher swore obedience to the King in causes ecclesiastical and spiritual, and persuaded other bishops to take the same oath, this can apply, as Mr. Gladstone sees, to the oath of succession only. The Act of Parliament imposing the oath passed on the 23rd of March, 1534, and the King's commissioners to enforce the oath were named on the 30th, on which day, according to Father Bridgett, it received the royal assent. Any taking the oath, or inducing others to take the oath, must have been after this. "The only admissible conclusion upon these facts," says Mr. Gladstone, "as to the question of date, seems to be that the King's urgency and Fisher's compliance, belong to the beginning of the period between the passing of the Act in the month of March, and the arrival of the Pope's sentence on the 12th of April" (p. 885). Father Bridgett points out that the news of the Pope's sentence came on Holy Saturday,\* which in 1534 was April 4. What Mr. Gladstone here calls "the period between the passing of the Act and the arrival of the Pope's sentence," the *beginning* of which "period" is Mr. Gladstone's date for Fisher's compliance, is reduced practically to four days.

But supposing the "period" to have been twelve days, or twenty, dating back to the passing of the Act, even before the appointment of commissioners or the royal assent, this "period" is in March and April 1534. Now, Mr. Gladstone says that Sander places the time "in the year 1533 (according to the old method of computation) and before the definitive sentence of the Pope," which is assigned to "the 23rd of March in that year, but after the Act of Succession had passed." If so, Sander must be wrong in the date by Mr. Gladstone's own showing, for the definitive sentence of the Pope, and the passing of the Act of Succession both happened on the same day, March 23, 1534. It cannot therefore be said that "Sander himself supplies us with sufficient means of judgment." But further, Father Bridgett says :

In fact, Sander gives no date whatever to the document he quotes. He introduces it, indeed, as if it were the final sentence of Clement VII. "The Roman Pontiff," he says, "after the most rigid examination of the question between Henry and Catharine, declared them bound together in the bonds of lawful wedlock beyond the power

---

\* Father Bridgett's authority is Chapuys. "Letters and Papers of Henry VIII., " vol. vii. 469.

of man to sunder." It was natural, then, for Mr. Gladstone, if he read no further than this, to conclude that the date of this document would be March 23, 1533-4. But if he will read the document itself he will find that Sander entirely mistook its nature. Sander gives, not the definitive sentence of March 23, 1534, but the Bull of August 8, 1533, a solemn censure against Henry and Cranmer for daring to proceed to the divorce from Catharine, and marriage with Anne, *pendente lite*. Any argument, therefore, drawn from this document, would prove that the supposed oath was taken before August 1533, consequently several months before the passing of the Act of Succession. Nor can it be said that Sander intended to refer to the date of March, 1534, when the final Bull was really issued, though he inadvertently transcribed the wrong document; for this document is given by German-Sander (as well as Roman-Sander), and so little knowledge had he of the real sequence of events that he supposes the final decision of the Pope to have preceded the divorce pronounced by Cranmer, whereas it was, in fact, a year later. In the long interpolation of Roman-Sander there is only one explicit date. The writer says that *after* Fisher had induced the Bishops to take the oath to the King, Cranmer, being thereby strengthened, proceeded to pronounce the divorce; and, again, after that, Henry solemnly married Anne on Easter Eve, 1533. We know that this was in 1533 not 1534, and the author also says in marginal note: *Nuptiae Annae in vigilia Paschatis 1533*. I am not aware of any nuptial solemnities between Henry and Anne beyond the mysterious private marriage in November, 1532, but the chroniclers agree that Anne appeared for the first time as Queen on Holy Saturday, 1533. I conclude then that, to use Mr. Gladstone's phrase, it is "beyond any reasonable doubt" that Roman-Sander places his oath-taking in 1533, and that he could not refer to the oath of succession, if he knew what he was writing about.—(Tablet, November 16, 1889.)

To this it may be added that it was the real Sander (that is to say, Rishton's own edition) who made this mistake of one document for another. The definitive sentence itself, dated March 23, 1534, in very different terms from the condemnation of the marriage contracted *pendente lite*, may be read in Tierney's Dodd;\* and as to the date of the document given by Sander, the Roman Editor attributes it to 1533, its true date, and it is not allowable for Mr. Gladstone to say "according to the old method of computation." With Papal *Bulls*, the year began with Lady Day, as in England till 1752, and this usage still continues; but with all other Papal documents that were not *Bulls*, it was not so. Now these Apostolic Letters of Clement VII., of which a series is printed by Tierney, though called by him in their respective headings *Bulls*, are not really *Bulls*. The inhibition, forbidding Henry to contract a second marriage, dated

\* Dodd's "Church History," by Rev. M. A. Tierney, vol. i., p. 408.

March 7, 1530, is a Brief, and the year is according to modern computation.\* The second inhibition,† dated January 5, 1531, is also a Brief; so is the Pope's letter‡ to the King dated January 25, 1532. If we may not change any of these dates, on account of their falling before Lady Day in their respective years, so neither may Mr. Gladstone assume that a Papal document, that he believes to be dated March 23, 1533, was really issued in 1534, unless it is a Bull. An example of a Bull, the date of which requires changing for modern computation, is the famous *Regnans in excelsis* of S. Pius V. against Elizabeth. It is dated 1569, 5 Kal. Mart. Pontif. 5; that is February 25, 1570.

Another indication that the Roman Editor had 1533 in his mind, and not 1534, is that he inserts this story of Fisher's defection before the birth of Elizabeth, which event was on the 7th of September, 1533; but further to insist on showing that the story, too hastily taken from Hilliard, does not belong to 1534, is to slay the slain, for Mr. Gladstone has frankly abandoned it, in terms of well-deserved eulogy on Father Bridgett's "remarkable assiduity and acumen." But in abandoning Sander as a witness to a certain course of conduct in 1534, Mr. Gladstone says: "For myself, I own to an impression that Bishop Fisher did, after the Convocation of 1531, do something that he afterwards regretted, but what or when I cannot feel very sure." Unhappily the proverb is true, that if a false statement is made, and mud thrown, some of the mud will stick. It is hard on the memory of Blessed John Fisher that Mr. Gladstone should say this. The evidence is rejected that once seemed to authorize a definite and specific accusation, and Mr. Gladstone, instead of dismissing the accused without a stain on his character, still "owns to an impression" that Bishop Fisher did something wrong, though what or when he does not know. Justice is due to the dead as well as to the living, and the same justice that is due to the living is due to the dead.

We suppose, then, that Mr. Gladstone has abandoned the explicit belief, founded on the pseudo-Sander, that Fisher took the oath of succession in 1534. If so, he will no longer maintain that Burnet makes a statement "in a manner to leave no room for doubt," that "all the bishops swore, Fisher, of course, included" (p. 885). Mr. Gladstone acknowledges that Burnet speaks "with some want of distinct specification as to dates." It is plain enough that Burnet is speaking of 1535. He should not be so read by Mr. Gladstone as needlessly to be made to contradict himself, and to Burnet's explicit statement we have

\* Dodd's "Church History," vol. i. pp. 364, 366.

† *Ibid.* p. 398.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 407.

already called Mr. Gladstone's attention. He sweeps it on one side as irrelevant, because it is "Burnet's account of Fisher's behaviour at the trial." But if Burnet knew that Fisher had ever taken the oath of succession, he could not have said without qualification, as he does, that "Sir Thomas More and the Bishop of Rochester refused to take the oath as it was conceived, whose fall being so remarkable, I shall show the steps of it."\* Is this what Mr. Gladstone calls "Burnet's account of Fisher's behaviour at the trial?" And for any previous mention of Fisher by Burnet, so far from his having already taken the oath of succession, he says, "Fisher was still obstinate and *made no submission*, and so was included within the act for misprision of treason [with Elizabeth Barton]; and yet I do not find that the King proceeded against him upon this act, till by new provocations he drew a heavier storm of indignation upon himself."† New provocations, not submissions, says Burnet; and this, with the explicit statement that "More and Fisher refused to take the oath as it was conceived," should have saved Mr. Gladstone from supposing that Burnet could have meant to include Fisher in a general statement, made some eighty pages later, that all the bishops took the oath.

May we now consider that the authorities are disposed of, whom Mr. Gladstone originally alleged? His statement was (p. 8), that "after the Act of Headship had been passed by Parliament in 1534, and the Oath of Succession was framed by the King, so as to include the headship, *Fisher took it.*"‡ The first reference he gave was Burnet, "Hist. i. 206." For this passage Mr. Gladstone now substitutes a statement by Burnet that the bishops in 1535 all took the oath, which he interprets as including Fisher, who was in prison; and that he was in prison *for refusing to take it*, Mr. Gladstone tells us "needs no showing," Burnet having broadly stated that he "refused it." This disposes of Burnet. The next reference is to Sander, of which no more need be said; and the third is to Brewer, or, more properly, Gairdner, "Letters and Papers of Henry VIII," v., No. 112, p. 50. This last reference is to a letter from Chapuys to Charles V. in 1531, which can in no way support Mr. Gladstone's statement that Fisher took the oath of succession in 1534, or his "impression that Bishop Fisher did, *after* the Convocation of 1531, do something that he afterwards regretted," we refer later to the terms of this letter.

We may then safely pass on from this definite accusation against Fisher to the proof of what his conduct really was in 1531.

\* Burnet, Ed. Pocock, vol. i. p. 155. Burnet's short notice of Fisher's trial is much later on in the volume, p. 353. † *Ibid.* p. 154.

‡ *The Nineteenth Century*, July 1888, p. 8, and note.

Father Bridgett concluded his admirable papers in the *Tablet* by these words :

Let me say, in conclusion, that though Dr. Hall had Hillyard's narrative before his eyes, he utterly rejected it; and, in its place, gave the history of the Convocation, as he derived it from one who had better means of knowing the truth. This was Justice Rastall, the nephew of Sir Thomas More. His manuscript is in the British Museum, in two forms: in a long extract, and in notes. But into this matter I will not enter.—(*Tablet*, November 23, 1889.)

That Convocation of 1531 is of such great importance that we make no scruple of availing ourselves of Father Bridgett's kindness, which enables us to insert here the words in which Mr. Justice Rastall records the part taken by Bishop Fisher in its proceedings. Mr. Gladstone says :

It has always been supposed that the limiting words [*quantum per Christi legem licet*] were proposed by Warham. Mr. Bridgett prefers, on authority which seems to me highly apocryphal, to ascribe them to Fisher himself, into whose mouth Hall, his biographer, puts a speech with the air of a modern report. In this speech he advises them to make the Recognition in its qualified form as a choice of evils. . . . That Fisher was the adviser is highly improbable, for he was a man of aye and no, not of compromises and expedients (p. 891, 2).

Now, the authority which seems to Mr. Gladstone "highly apocryphal" is that of Hall. But Hall's authority was that of Mr. Justice Rastall, and no one will call that apocryphal. Mr. Gladstone will surely not prefer to it that of Hilliard, who, being then in the company of Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall, narrates in the first person plural, how the Bishop of Durham, on his way to London, was met by royal messengers, and sent back to his diocese. The rumours that reached Hilliard in the north of England respecting the conduct of Bishop Fisher, though he afterwards became confused as to the order of events, is surely confirmatory of Rastall's account, not contradictory. And Hilliard does not say that Fisher took any oath. According to him, Fisher, "*necessitati præsenti cedendum ratus, persuasit reliquis . . . ut saltem cum exceptione illa prædicta (quantum per Dei Verbum liceret) obedientiam regi in causis ecclesiasticis ac spiritualibus jurarent.*" There was no oath in question in 1531, and it was not till afterwards that the headship came explicitly to mean obedience to the king in all ecclesiastical and spiritual causes; but when the oath was imposed, and the meaning of the royal headship was clear, it was not surprising that a writer should describe in these words the event that is related as follows by the excellent testimony of a man of high station and legal training. The passage from the Harleian MS.

7047, p. 11, is as follows, a little of the verbiage being omitted :—

"The king moved the Convocation by his confederates to acknowledge him to be Head of the Church, which they denied ; and then the confederates took upon them to dispute openly on the king's behalf, and by disputation they were confounded, and being but a very few in respect of the rest, they perceived they laboured in vain. Wherefore the king sent for divers of the bishops and the best of the Convocation, and exhorting them to agree to his demand, protesting and swearing that he would not challenge thereby any new authority or spiritual jurisdiction, but only the very same that he and his predecessors had already of his royal power, and minded thereby to require no further authority over the spirituality. The king's confederates reported to the Convocation the king's meaning . . . and they affirmed that they were not good and true subjects to the king that would not give their consent to his demand and credit him in his protestation and oath. The Convocation seemed to be resolved with these empty persuasions ; but the good Bishop of Rochester denied to grant it, and required the Convocation to consider well what inconveniences would ensue by the grant of supremacy to the king thus absolutely and *simpliciter*, if the king changed his mind. . . . The king's confederates replied how the king had no such meaning as the bishop feared, alleging the royal oath, and that though it were granted absolutely, yet it should and must needs have implied in it the condition *quantum per legem Dei licet*, which is (quoth they) that he, being a temporal prince, cannot by God's law intermeddle as Supreme Head with spiritual jurisdiction, spiritual laws, or spiritual matters. The whole Convocation were by these crafty persuasions and other secret practices, fully persuaded to credit the king herein ; which being perceived by the Bishop of Rochester, and *being angry with this so sudden and light persuasion, and withal very loth that the grant should pass thus absolutely, and not being able to stay it otherwise* : ' If you will need, quoth he, grant the king this his request, yet for declaration of your full meaning, express these conditional words in your grant: *Quantum, etc.*' The king's confederates urged still to have the grant pass absolutely ; but the Convocation answered resolutely that they would not grant the title without these words. Whereof the king by his confederates being made secretly privy, and seeing he could not obtain it otherwise, was of force contented to accept it conditionally."

In the second edition of the "Life of Blessed John Fisher," which we hope soon to welcome, Father Bridgett proposes to call attention to the fact that all this is identical with the account

given by Hall, who has even adopted whole phrases from Rastall, amongst others those italicized above. Father Bridgett adds that the unknown author of the Latin life in the Arundel MSS. declares that when the rest had signed their names to the decree or address to the king, Fisher, not content with the condition (*protestatione*) contained in the document itself, subscribed: “*Joannes Roffensis, quatenus Verbo Dei consentit.*” Hall’s account ought no longer to seem to Mr. Gladstone “highly apocryphal.” Here, surely, is the foundation, in fact, of the statement in the Roman edition of Sander, of which Mr. Gladstone has made so much.

That judgments were not altogether favourable to Bishop Fisher, as to his part in the Convocation of 1531, is shown by the words of one who was in a far better position to hear the facts than Hillyard was. In the letter,\* to which Mr. Gladstone has given a reference, useless for his purpose, though useful to us, Chapuys wrote to the Emperor from London in February 1531, that Anne Boleyn’s “father, speaking a few days ago to the Bishop of Rochester, ventured to say he could prove by the authority of Scripture that when God left this world, he left no successor or vicar. There is none that do not blame this usurpation [of the title of ‘Supreme Head’], except those who have promoted it. The Chancellor (More) is so mortified at it that he is anxious above all things to resign his office. The Bishop of Rochester is very ill with disappointment at it. He opposes it as much as he can; but being threatened that he and his adherents should be thrown in the river, *he was forced to consent to the King’s will.*” It is true that this means nothing more than that Bishop Fisher had assented to the conditional recognition of the royal supremacy, but the expression of Chapuys shows how strong an impression Fisher’s share in that recognition created. Hillyard’s statement that Fisher said that it was his duty as a Bishop to have taught others what the Word of God permitted, and not to have left the truth to an “ambiguous exception,” is eminently probable; but, of course, with reference to the Convocation of 1531 and nothing else.

As to the opinion of the real Nicholas Sander respecting Fisher, Mr. Gillow has made the excellent suggestion that it should be taken from the work “*De Visibili Monarchia,*” † published in his lifetime, for which, therefore, he is personally responsible. It is quite incompatible with any belief on Sander’s part that Fisher’s conduct had been such as has been published under his name. His words may be translated thus:—“After that the Bishop of Rochester had written these excellent things [against Luther], it

\* “Letters and Papers,” v. n. 112.

† Louvain, 1571, folio, p. 590.

happened that Henry VIII., king of England, tired of his holy wife, Catharine, put her away, and wanted to marry Anne Boleyn. When he could not obtain leave to do so from Pope Clement VII., forgetting all that he had written against Luther, forgetful indeed of Christ and His faith, he resolved to set aside the Pope's authority, and govern the Christian republic in England at his own pleasure, and then give himself a dispensation for putting away his first wife (the mother of his daughter Mary, afterwards queen) and for marrying another. He wished, therefore, not only to be called Supreme Head of the English Church immediately under Christ, but for it to be written down and sworn to. When the most holy Bishop of Rochester would not worship this idol, God gave him the crown of martyrdom as the reward of his labours. For when the tyrant heard that the dignity of Cardinal had been given to him (which the Pope gave him, that the honour due to it might prevent the king from killing him), fearing for himself from one so great, he caused this old man, who was worthy of all veneration, to be deprived of that life that he could not long have kept in the course of nature. What the Bishop of Rochester had written about the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, this he sealed with the shedding of his blood. When he came to the place of execution, he said hardly anything except *Te Deum laudamus, te Dominum confitemur*; and with this song of the swan he ended the present life, and began that which is to come."

Such is the way in which the veritable Sander speaks of Fisher, and it is evident that he either never heard of, or summarily rejected, the story that the Bishop of Rochester induced other Bishops to yield to the king. And now we may leave to the oblivion it deserves the story that Mr. Gladstone has discovered and abandoned. Our assertion is, we hope, fully borne out, that "while many refused the oath of the king's supremacy, there are two men, at least, of whom it can be positively asserted that they did not, and would not, take the oath of succession, and these two were More and Fisher."\*

This disposes of a great portion of Mr. Gladstone's second article, but there still remain several points in it that require attention.

1. The Recognition of 1531 spoke of the king as the *singularis protector*, the *unicus et supremus dominus* of the Church, as well as its *supremum caput*. On the first of these titles there is no debate. We took them to mean much the same as "Defender of the Faith," and Mr. Gladstone passes this by. But the second title, *unicus et supremus dominus*, he regards as agreeing with the third title, "in being sufficient to cover, and

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1888, p. 252.

even to require, the exclusion of the Papal, as of all extraneous, jurisdiction (p. 7). In reply, it was said that these words were not in the original draft of the parenthesis, nor in the form brought by Lord Rochford to the Convocation as the king's *ultimatum*. They were the voluntary insertion by Archbishop Warham and the Convocation that for so many days had resisted the recognition of the king's supremacy. It was then regarded by Convocation as a title that they could safely give, for the term *dominus* no more trenched on their spiritual authority than did the previous term *protector*. We pointed out to Mr. Gladstone that his own statement that the words "excited no scruple on the part of either the prelates or the clergy" (p. 7) was fatal to his interpretation of them; and we ventured to suggest that their meaning was that "the King of England was their supreme feudal lord, and of course the only one, as no one had ever dreamt of attributing such a position to the Pope." Mr. Gladstone replies with much force that "the king was not feudal lord of the Church, but only of particular fiefs held by certain of its members" (p. 887). Our meaning was simply that Henry was the lord to whom they did homage for their temporalities; and this surely, or something very like it, is the sense attached to the words by Tunstall, in the passage quoted by Mr. Gladstone, "Et similiter declarandum et exprimendum puto verba illa, scilicet, unicum et supremum dominum in temporalibus post Christum accipi." It is straining the king's letter to Tunstall to make it give the words, the "wider meaning" of the exclusion of papal jurisdiction. The king was minimizing the effect of the words "Supreme Head," and was arguing that as they did not touch the headship of Christ, so neither did they affect that of the Pope; and his argument is, "You might as well require qualifications to the term *Dominus*, which is one we daily apply to Christ."

2. As to the parenthetical form in which the recognition of supremacy was made, Mr. Gladstone has misunderstood our meaning, and for this the form of the phrase in our former article is responsible. He says that "What a parenthesis contains is grammatically capable of severance from the sentence in which it is found, but its contents have as full force in regard to their substance as if there were no use of parenthetical signs at all" (p. 894). This is so, of course, and a parenthesis in a law, or sentence of a judge, may be an intrinsic part of that law or judgment, with the same legal force as the rest. But, in this case, it must belong to the judgment; for a parenthesis is a very natural form for a judge to use, in order to mark that what he is saying is not part of the judgment, but an *obiter dictum*. Now, if this parenthesis contained matter perfectly irrelevant to the subject of the judgment, a lawyer would at once assume that

the parenthesis was very properly employed to indicate that it was an *obiter dictum*. Certainly if a judge were decreeing that the Convocation of Canterbury was bound to pay the king the sum of £100,044 8s. 8d., and, when he mentioned the king, were to call him by some title, it would be clear that it was the opinion of that judge that such a title belonged to the king, but it would not be a judicial decision to that effect.

"An *obiter dictum*," as Mr. Gladstone understands it, "is an opinion beside the purpose of the instrument in which the opinion is given, and is commonly found in a speech, not in a sentence" (p. 894). Nay, not in a speech, because the whole speech consists of opinions; but in a sentence, where the main tenor is judicial, which the *obiter dictum* contained in the judge's sentence, is not. "To say that the assertion is beside the purpose of the instrument," Mr. Gladstone continues, "is to beg the question, what was the purpose: whether the purpose was the single one of granting the subsidy, or the double one of accepting the supremacy together with the grant of the subsidy?" Yet Mr. Gladstone had himself used the phrase: "It is not at first sight so plain why to the grant of the subsidy should have been tacked the acknowledgment of the headship" (p. 9)." The subsidy of, say a million of our money, was the price the clergy were to pay for their liberation from the preposterous *Premunire*, in which the whole realm was held to be involved by its acceptance of Wolsey as Legate. "The king's temporal subjects" were pardoned by the Act 22 Henry VIII. c. 16, and the pardon was to be extended to the clergy in consideration of the subsidy, provided that in the preamble the king's supremacy was recognized. It is plain enough why the one was tacked to the other. And no one can raise a doubt that, be the form of the recognition what it may, in a parenthesis or out of parenthesis, in a preamble or in the body of a bill, "whether the purpose was the single one of granting the subsidy, or the double one of accepting the supremacy together with the grant of the subsidy," the members of the Convocation who voted for it were entirely responsible for accepting the royal supremacy, and for the terms in which they accepted it. No parenthesis could save them from that. But was this parenthesis a law of the church, that continued to be a law of the church till it was formally repealed? This is Mr. Gladstone's contention, and our remark on its parenthetical form was intended only to show that it was not. The only law in the case was that binding the clergy to pay the subsidy. For the supremacy of the king was not the subject matter of a law. As Mr. Mivart has argued with great force and cogency, it was *ultra vires* for the Convocation to make any law on the subject, and it is useful to observe that its recognition is

not couched in the form of an enactment. In Mr. Gladstone's eyes it is a declaratory law; and if it is not that, his argument fails to the ground, that it is the legal basis still in force on which the Church of England now rests, and that this "basis of legality" was laid by Warham and Fisher.

3. With reference to p. 257 of our former article, Mr. Gladstone says: "Mr. Morris erroneously states that the proceeding in Convocation at this later epoch (1534) was 'nothing but an answer by the Lower House' to a question concerning the Pope. On the contrary, the proceeding seems to have been complete; and it was beyond doubt a proceeding in both the Convocations" (p. 888). We limited the proceedings to the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation, under the guidance of Bishop Stubbs,\* who summarises the official record thus:

March 31, Ralph Pexsall, clerk of the Crown in Chancery, presented the writ for proroguing Convocation to the 4th of November. After this, an instrument was presented which had been drawn up by William Saye, in which the Lower House gave answer to the question, "Has the Roman Pontiff any greater jurisdiction in this realm of England conferred upon him by God in Holy Scripture, than any other foreign bishop?" On this there were thirty-four votes in the negative, one doubtful, and four affirmative.

Where Mr. Gladstone has found the proceedings of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, we do not know. It is of little consequence, except on the ground of accuracy, for the important point is that there was here no ecclesiastical legislation that was capable of repeal, but only an answer to a question concerning the Pope; which answer was matter affecting the consciences of those who gave it, as did the similar answers of the Universities, but which furnishes no "basis of legality" by the force of ecclesiastical law.

4. Mr. Gladstone complains of our "want of precision," that we should have spoken of "the Pope's authority" as a synonym for his "jurisdiction." We have erred in good company, if it be an error. Sander, in the passage we have translated above, says that the king "resolved to set aside the Pope's authority;" and Bishop Stubbs in the passage quoted by us, characterized by Mr. Gladstone as "weighty words," uses the expression "renunciation of Papal authority" in exactly the same sense with ourselves. It was not Papal authority but Papal jurisdiction, aversion to which Mr. Gladstone maintains "had spread generally among the English clergy" (p. 889). On this Father Sydney Smith has commented with great acuteness and perfect truth:—

---

\* "Ecclesiastical Courts Commission," 1883, vol. i. p. 106.

The proposition which Mr. Gladstone apparently maintains seems to us the exact opposite of the reality. If we take "authority" in the sense he suggests, of moral weight and credit—as for instance, he himself may be said to possess high "authority" with the Liberal Party—then it may be said with some plausibility that there was a good deal of dislike for Papal "authority." The English clergy during the Middle Ages were largely infected with the notion that the Papal Court cared little for their country, save as a mine from which to extract money, and accordingly they were wont to entertain a strong dislike for the *personnel* which composed it. On the other hand, we can safely challenge Mr. Gladstone to produce a single tittle of evidence of any prepossession against Papal "jurisdiction." Fights over the frontier line between the spiritual and temporal domain he will find, and find in abundance; but from the time of S. Augustine to the time of Archbishop Warham he will not find signs of anything but the most unswerving attachment to the spiritual "jurisdiction," grounded on the deep-rooted belief in its divine appointment as the centre of Catholic unity.—(*The Month*, December, 1889, p. 480.)

5. In a foot-note to his second article (p. 888) Mr. Gladstone "desires to recede from the statement" made in his first article (p. 8), "that the remarkable petition against annates proceeded from the clergy, in which" he had "simply followed Strype, Wilkins, and Blunt. Mr. Gairdner considers it to be a petition from Parliament." It is with no feeling of disrespect to Mr. Gladstone that we note that, in his first article, in "proof of the sentiments of the clergy with respect to Papal jurisdiction," he referred to this document as "their perfectly voluntary, if suggested, petition in Convocation in the year 1531." On this we ventured to say, in comment,\* that "the document has no date, and it would be extremely interesting to learn where Mr. Gladstone has discovered that it was 'suggested' to Convocation to make such a petition, and that, when made, it was 'perfectly voluntary.'" Now that Mr. Gladstone recedes from the statement that the petition proceeded from the clergy at all, it would be still more interesting to learn whence he drew the information that it was "perfectly voluntary, if suggested."

6. On the plea that the Recognition of 1531 was "obtained by terrorism, which amounts to coercion, and was therefore void," Mr. Gladstone observes that "in the whole field of political argumentation, there is no more perilous"—he "had almost written more pestilent—doctrine than that which exempts persons in authority from obligation to their acts and words on the plea of coercion" (p. 891). That it is a "perilous doctrine" is plain enough; and the plea of terrorism was not put forward by us as any proof that the Recognition was void. Mr. Gladstone had

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, Oct. 1888, p. 254.

said that "it was no mere submission to violence," and that "while some allowance must be made for royal pressure, it was expressive of that aversion to the Papal jurisdiction which had spread generally among the English clergy" (p. 8). To us it seemed to be "more in accordance with historical truth to say that the Recognition of the royal supremacy is as little like a solemn instrument as it possibly could be; but it was extorted from the clergy to save them from destruction; that it was most reluctantly passed after several days' resistance, and that, when passed, it was with a qualifying clause that at least made it disputable."\* It was extorted from the clergy, but we have not pleaded that it was void on that account, for we very explicitly said† that "of course no one dreams of denying that all the members of that Convocation were responsible for their silence." But the "royal pressure" on the clergy is described by Mr. Gairdner in terms very different from Mr. Gladstone's:—

They were altogether helpless. Under the existing law of *Præmuniare* they were quite at the king's mercy. It was an engine that might be turned against them capriciously on the most slender pretexts; and, knowing its power, they might well have been glad to purchase immunity for the future by a frank recognition of that supremacy to which they were already compelled to bow in practice.

This passage we placed before Mr. Gladstone in our former article, not to prove that there was no binding legal force in the Recognition, as if it were an unrepealed law—that we have abundantly established—but to show that the Recognition carried with it no moral weight. Mr. Gladstone is anxious to trace his "basis of legality" to men of a better stamp than Cranmer. The meaning of coercion as a plea is that courage at any rate was not the prominent feature in the personages to whom he now refers the origin of the "juridical position" held by the Church of England "ever since, down to the present day."

7. Nor did we advance the other plea, that "the Recognition was so insignificant that it did not require repeal or notice of any kind." No one could call the Recognition insignificant, for that, an heretical and schismatical declaration by the Houses of Convocation, could never be. If this is not the description of the Recognition of 1531, it is because it is qualified by the condition that we owe to the fidelity of Fisher. It is the true description unreservedly of the rejection of the Pope in 1534. That these needed no repeal is not due to their insignificance but to their character. Opinions cannot be repealed, and these were opinions of two Convocations, not laws. An historical fact cannot be re-

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, p. 253.

† Ibid. p. 247.

pealed. The Convocation under Mary did what it had to do. It petitioned Parliament for the repeal of all statutes made against the liberties and jurisdiction of the Church, but there were no ecclesiastical laws made by the Convocations of England in the direction of Henry's reformation for it to repeal. As we have already said, "It never occurred to any one that there was need to repeal the parenthesis of 1531, or the answer of the Lower House to a doctrinal question in 1534." Convocation could and did kneel for absolution for such misdeeds, and that was all that it could do.

8. Lastly, Mr. Gladstone finds in Father Bridgett's "Life of Blessed John Fisher," "and in the works of other Roman Catholic writers, the omission of a material element of the case before us —namely, a regard to the National Church in itself, as distinct from the royal influence and power on the one side, and the Papal Chair on the other" (p. 886). In truth there is no mystery here, neither has Mr. Gladstone made any discovery. Naturally enough, a bishop's thoughts fly first of all to his own flock, and then to the rest of the faithful in the country, who are under the same circumstances. When Henry, in 1531, claimed recognition as Supreme Head of the Church, the alarm created by the claim in the minds of the bishops and clergy was undoubtedly for their own jurisdiction and immunity, and not, in the first instance, for the Pope. This is exactly what Father Bridgett has taken great pains to show, and we not only referred Mr. Gladstone to this important passage in our last article,\* but also, after quoting Bishop Stubbs to the same effect, we adduced Henry's letter to the Bishop of Durham as the King's own declaration that the Pope was not then assailed by the Royal claim to supremacy. It was natural that at first there should be no great anxiety about the jurisdiction of the Pope. It was exercised out of the kingdom, and was acknowledged by all Christendom. It had never been contested. Its rejection must have seemed an impossibility. But the independence of their own spiritual jurisdiction at home, including, of course, the right of appeal to Rome, had been perpetually hampered by the Crown. Under the Conqueror and his sons, under the Plantagenets, and now under the Tudors, the Bishops of England had striven against unceasing encroachments on the part of the kings. Even at the moment they were smarting under the intolerable tyranny of a *Premunire*, and they were fining themselves in an enormous sum to bribe the king to pardon them for an imaginary offence. No wonder that when the tyrant claimed recognition of a title that implied indefinite power over the

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, October 1888, p. 250.

Church, their thoughts should have been directed to the body rather than to the head of the Church, and that their fear should have been, not so much for the Pope and his power, as for themselves and their own spiritual jurisdiction, as bishops placed by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God. And thus in the account of the discussion in Convocation given us by Justice Rastall, we are told that "the king sent for divers of the bishops and the best of the Convocation, and exhorting them to agree to his demand, protesting and swearing that he would not challenge thereby any new authority or spiritual jurisdiction, but only the very same that he and his predecessors had already of his regal power, and minded thereby to require *no further authority over the spirituality.*" This is precisely the view of Bishop Stubbs: "Warham and More might interpret [the Recognition of 1531] as implying no greater negation of Papal power than was immemorially part of the legal system of England." It was for their own sake, and for the sake of their flocks, that in 1531 the clergy was so reluctant to recognize the royal supremacy, as well as, of course, for the Pope's, whose authority and jurisdiction was the completion of the spiritual power and independence of the Church, of which their own was a part; and thus the saving clause introduced by Blessed John Fisher was meant as a protest in favour of episcopal and sacerdotal, as well as Papal, jurisdiction. "A regard to the National Church in itself!" Of course they had. "Si quis suorum, et maxime domesticorum, curam non habet, fidem negavit et est infideli deterior" (1 Tim. v. 8). But their regard for the National Church did not lead them to prefer a part to the whole, or have a less regard to the Church Universal and its visible head. We should not argue that because a man was a loving father of a family, or a dutiful son, that therefore he was less zealous for the welfare of his country, or was any the less a true patriot. The good Catholic, who cares the most for the rights and prerogatives of the Holy See, is the very man who is the most full of "regard" for the honours of bishops and of priests, and of the local interests of souls.

It is singular that Mr. Gladstone does not see that the originality he claims for his discoveries is simply fatal to them. He should perceive that the improbability is very great that it should have been left to him to discover that in declaring Henry their "sole and supreme lord," without any qualifying words, Warham and Fisher were committing themselves to the absolute rejection of Papal jurisdiction. It has been, as he thought it would be, "matter of surprise to most readers," that he should claim Warham and Fisher as the foundation-stones of the Reformation. Students of history will not follow him in his new theories and interpretation of facts. Those who have succeeded in persuading

themselves that they are the old Church of England, though they reject the Pope's authority, may be grateful to him for help that his dialectic skill can render plausible, but he will not change the common-sense conviction of Englishmen that Cranmer and Lee, and "the reforming prelates," are the genuine fathers of the modern Church of England.

JOHN MORRIS, S.J., F.S.A.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE BALTIMORE CENTENARY.

THE year just closed was memorable for the Centennial celebrations of three remarkable events, each making an epoch in the history of humanity. The first was the Proclamation on April 30 of the Constitution of the United States by the revolted colonies of Great Britain; the second, the assemblage on May 5th of the States-General at Versailles, the opening act of the lurid drama of the Revolution; the third, the creation of a Catholic hierarchy in the United States by the erection of Baltimore into an Episcopal See in the Papal Consistory of November 6th.

Nor is this close triple sequence of date the only bond of connection between events, which though widely different in character and origin, resembled each other in exercising a still greater transforming influence on human thought in the future than in the actual times in which they occurred. The first, though purely political in its results, has had the effect of re-creating the standard of civil government by the preponderating weight thrown into the scale of democracy. A still wider scope had the subsequent revolution, whose aim was to subvert not only the existing machinery of the State, but the whole range of human ideals in the social, moral, and spiritual orders as well. The second great modern revolt against supernatural authority, it effected for the Latin Races what the Reformation had done for the Teutonic, by detaching them from their allegiance to the Church, while carrying to a still further stage of development the principle of the supremacy of the human intelligence implicitly contained in the movement of Luther. The result was the partial apostacy of the Old Continent, culminating, during the present century, in the attack on the Papacy, the most venerable symbol of divine authority on earth. The revolutionary dogma

is still leavening Europe, but a century of trial has somewhat discredited its efficacy, and there are in many quarters symptoms of a wholesome reaction against its ascendancy.

But while the year 1789 was marked as fateful in both hemispheres by events of such portent for futurity, the third occurrence that signalized its course passed almost unnoticed amid the rush of action that ushered in the stormy dawn of the nineteenth century. A Papal Decree establishing a new See in a remote quarter of the globe was little likely to attract attention during the hurrying phases of violence to which the meeting of the States-General six months before had been the prelude. Only in the truer historical perspective created by the lapse of a century can the relative significance of the three-fold anniversaries of 1789 be duly appreciated. Only in the remoteness of a past epoch of time can we discern the actual proportions and relations of accomplished facts, distorted or magnified by the partial view of closer proximity.

Thus, we only begin to see to-day how the Revolution in America in one sense counterbalanced that in Europe, by providing a fresh and congenial soil for the development of the ideas it had sought to extirpate, and how the truer liberties of the New Continent fostered and sheltered the faith persecuted in the name of a false liberty in the Old. Only to-day do we see how the branch lopped off at home took fresh root on Transatlantic soil, and how the exiled Church, thriving in transplantation, developed new vigour and vitality in its second growth. The refugee clergy of France and its dependencies arrived at the very moment when religion, languishing for lack of ecclesiastical teachers, threatened to die out in many parts of the American Union, and when its extension to new regions by means of Catholic colonization was being sterilized from the same cause. Thus the exterminating decrees of the Convention were the direct agencies for securing it a firm footing in the Western Promised Land of humanity, and not alone the blood of the martyrs actually slain, but the sufferings of the confessors who survived to toil and witness anew, were, then as ever, "the seed of the Church." It is in this sense that the three events of 1789 were so closely interwoven in that complicated web of human events, the true relation between whose parts only becomes visible as we retreat to a certain distance from the point where it is being unrolled from the loom of time.

The history of the Church in the United States dates back to an earlier period than that of its second foundation a century ago. It had even a prehistoric existence there during that semi-mythical, but now generally accepted phase of transitory transatlantic settlement by our Scandinavian kinsfolk, the Vikings.

These daring freebooters not only planted the now desolate shores of Greenland with flourishing Christian communities, but sailing thence southward, in the opening years of the eleventh century, explored the coasts of New England, and anticipated the enterprise of Columbus. The country colonized by the Northmen, and named by them Vinland, is localized by general consent of modern writers, in the district of Newport, Rhode Island, and the southern portion of Massachusetts. The Pilgrim Fathers might thus have claimed the territory on which they landed by right of descent from these remote ancestors.

The first representation of the Cross in the New World is still extant in a very ancient inscription on what is called the Dighton Writing Rock, near Taunton, Massachusetts, on which it appears in several places. The lettering of which it forms part, is believed to commemorate an expedition of Northmen in 1007, undertaken as a sequel to an earlier one, in order to recover the remains of its leader, Thorwald, slain in a skirmish with the natives, and buried at a place called Krossaness, or the Promontory of Crosses, now identified as Point Alderton, south-east of Boston Bay. Deterioration of the climate of Greenland, hypothetically ascribed to deflection of the Gulf Stream, obliterated the nascent civilization of that hyperborean continent, and with it swept out of memory and existence the short-lived Norse-American Church of the Vikings.

To these preliminary gropings of Christianity succeeded its second period, when mankind had permanently entered into possession of the western half of its terrestrial inheritance. The missionaries who accompanied Columbus had penetrated, within a century after his first voyage, through greater part of what are now the Southern States of the Union. But, by the beginning of the seventeenth century, the colonizing energy of the Spaniard was spent, whether for religious or secular purposes, and the Church in America would have drowsed on in that semi-somnolent languor which broods over the old missions on the Pacific slope, had not the fresh vitalizing spirit of Anglo-Saxon manhood been infused into it from the North.

English colonization in America has an almost unique history in having received its most powerful initial impetus from religious enthusiasm. The little band of Puritan exiles, who obtained the charter of Massachusetts Bay in 1629, in order to found a sanctuary for freedom of conscience beyond the wave, were worthy in their stern though narrow sense of duty to be the inheritors of a continent and the progenitors of a nation. A spirit of fanaticism leavened the infant colony, and was the earnest of future greatness, even in the absence of those two most indomitable spirits, the frustration of whose resolve to join its founders, made

or marred the history of two peoples. Never, surely, was there an instance in which events were more blindly guided by human volition to an unseen end, than in the arbitrary action of Laud in staying, in 1638, a party of emigrants, with whom Cromwell and Hampden were about to leave their native land for ever.

But Catholicism, too, had its Pilgrim Fathers; for English statecraft, impartial in persecution, laid its hand with equal weight on all dissidents alike. The Charter of Maryland, granted in 1632 to Cecil Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, provided a home for another class of religious refugees, and hither came, in the following year, two hundred Catholic gentlemen in two ships—the “Dove” and the “Ark.” To their earliest settlement on the site of a deserted Indian village they gave the name of St. Mary’s, while the whole territory assigned them was called Maryland, in honour of the Catholic Queen of Charles II. The faith thus transplanted has been handed down as the most treasured birthright of the State, whose chief city, Baltimore, received the Primacy of the American Union by being constituted its first See.

The Transatlantic Church had not in its earlier stages been endowed with what it is the fashion of the day to call local autonomy, and the several European colonies were in ecclesiastical as in civil affairs subject to the parent State. Florida was under the jurisdiction of Spain; the North-Western Settlements, of France; the priests of the Atlantic States in the North were ruled by a Vicar-Apostolic in London, and the Jesuits everywhere corresponded immediately with Rome. This state of pupilage was felt as galling when the severance of the political tie between the British Colonies and the Mother Country had created a sense of national independence. In 1784 the clergy of the United States, despite the smallness of their number—not then exceeding 30—forwarded a petition to the Holy See requesting the appointment of a Superior or Vicar-Apostolic, who should have all the faculties of a bishop. The matter was already under discussion by the Sacred Congregation, and a favourable answer was at once returned. The Rev. John Carroll, a native of Maryland, and scion of one of the oldest settler families, originally of Irish extraction, was nominated to the new dignity. He was then about fifty years of age, and had passed the principal part of his life in Europe, having joined the Jesuit Order after an educational period divided between England and France. The famous Brief of Clement XIV. suppressing the Order, dissolved his connection with it, and from Bruges, where he then was, he went to England, returning thence to his native land. There he found little promise for the future of religion. No central authority existed in the country, and the priests, few

and scattered, were overburdened with the charge of districts of unmanageable extent. The legislation of the Mother Country still imposed disabilities on Catholic worship even in Maryland, the refuge of the exiles for faith, and the sectarian bitterness of the New England colonies was opposed to any relaxation of the existing laws. Under these circumstances the cause of national independence was ardently espoused by the Catholic colonists, who regarded it as that of religious no less than of civil freedom. The outbreak of the War of Independence in 1776 found the ex-Jesuit living with his mother at Rock Creek, within some ten miles of the present city of Washington, and from a little chapel on her estate ministering to the religious wants of the neighbourhood. From this retired life he was called to take an active part in passing events by his nomination as one of four Commissioners sent to Quebec to enlist the active co-operation of the Canadians with their brother colonists. The bigotry of the New England States cost them an alliance which would have revolutionized the destinies of the northern section of the continent. The Canadians, mindful of that part of the protest of their neighbours—which included among their grievances against the British Crown “the intolerable tyranny of the King of England in allowing the practice of the Popish religion in Canada”—declined their overtures for active co-operation, but were induced by the representations of Father Carroll to give assurances of neutrality. To this extent are the United States indebted to his influence for the triumph of their cause. From Quebec he returned to his mission at Rock Ferry, where he remained until called to assume the wider charge of Vicar-General, and head of the American clergy.

He at once [says Mr. J. Russell, in an article in the *New York Catholic News*\*] entered upon the duties of his new, and in some respects unique, dignity. The church at that time was not strong, nor were its adherents of the most fervid character. The lack of priestly ministrations and counsel had resulted in many cases in causing whole settlements to become lukewarm. These Father Carroll sought to reach. The first difficulty that stood in his way was the lack of priests. This was partially obviated by the immigration of a number of priests from Europe. Pastors were at once sent to New England, the Carolinas, and Kentucky, in which State there was a Catholic population of 4000 souls. For himself, in spite of his dignity, he worked hard in the cause of religion.

The result of his labours, during the five years he filled the position of Superior of the American clergy, was a great increase

\* Condensed from the Memorial Volume of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

in their numbers, but, with this extension of his sphere, his authority was found insufficient to decide all questions that arose, and his subordinates were sometimes inclined to dispute his ruling. The larger powers wielded by a bishop were necessary for the discipline of the Church whose organization required to be perfected in order to meet its growing needs.

The clergy [continues the above writer] applied to Rome for the foundation of an American See, and soon received a favourable answer, coupled with the privileges of selecting the See and nominating its first incumbent. The choice was soon made and forwarded to Rome. By a Bull of November 6th, 1789, Pope Pius VI. designated the City of Baltimore as the Episcopal See, and appointed John Carroll bishop and pastor of its cathedral church. He accepted the call, and in the summer of 1790 sailed for England. Arrived there, he presented himself before the Right Rev. Charles Walmsley, Vicar-Apostolic of London, for consecration. The ceremony took place in the private chapel of Thomas Weld, of Lulworth, who proffered his hospitality to Bishop Carroll during his stay in England. The bishop then sailed for the country to which he was now bound. He appreciated his responsibilities, and bent every effort towards making his administration successful for the Church. Before leaving England, he had arranged with the Sulpicians, who were driven from France, for the establishment of a theological school in his See, in order that he might draw on the rising generation in America for labourers in the vineyard. He attended personally to all the duties, clerical and otherwise, of his office, a task which entailed no small amount of labour. From all parts came requests for priests, and complaints of insufficient attention, occasionally varied by a dispute between a clergyman and his congregation. On all these matters Bishop Carroll had to adjudicate. He sought not only to conserve and consolidate the existing Church, but also to extend it. A number of fortuitous circumstances assisted him in carrying out his generous design. On the dying out of that opposition to the Jesuit Order which had wrung from Pope Clement the Bull of Suppression, the exiled and separated Fathers of the Order were called from that seclusion in which they had spent years. The decade which followed the consecration of Bishop Carroll was prolific in good. The opening of the present century witnessed, at the head of the American Church, a man possessed of remarkable administrative ability. The number of priests had increased, and with them flocks had grown in extent and devotion. Young men came forward to perform the sacred duties of the ministry, and by the year 1810 there were in the country nearly one hundred priests in charge of as many congregations.

An interesting picture of this period of Bishop Carroll's pastorate is contained in the "Life of Father Nerinckx,"\* one of the

---

\* "Life of the Rev. Charles Nerinckx," by the Rev. Camillus P. Maes. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke, 1880.

patriarchs of the Kentucky missions. Here we see the system of religious ramification, by which Maryland, the parent stem of Catholicity, threw out off-shoots to the farther west, sending forth groups of families which became, in their turn, so many centres of future colonization. William Coomes and his family, who moved in 1775 to Harrod's Station in Kentucky, were the first Catholic settlers in that, as yet, scarcely explored region, and were the pioneers of a movement which developed in ten years into a system of migration. In 1785 sixty Catholic families associated themselves together in a common purpose of settlement in Kentucky, their union serving at once for mutual defence against Indians and for the formation of a congregation capable of maintaining a priest and a church. The journey was then a formidable undertaking, involving many weeks of travel, partly by horse or waggon, and partly by boat from Pittsburgh down the Ohio. The latter part of the journey was not always peaceably accomplished, as the wooded banks of the stream afforded cover to the plumed and painted warriors, who resented the intrusion of white men into the untrodden wilds of "the Dark and Bloody Ground," as Kentucky is termed in their language.

The emigrants moved in detachments, twenty-five families the first year, and the remainder during the three years following. In company with one of these parties, with a certain Edward Howard as his fellow-traveller, went, in 1787, Father Whelan, an Irish Franciscan, the first Catholic priest to enter Kentucky. A pioneer in a material, no less than in a spiritual sense, we read that in riding through the forest, he "blazed" his track hunter-fashion, breaking off conspicuous branches at intervals as finger-posts for subsequent travellers. The emigrants settled in what was then called Jefferson County, now divided into Nelson, Washington, and Marion Counties. In the summer of 1790 their numbers were reinforced by fresh contingents from North Carolina and Tennessee, led by Father William de Rohan, an Irish priest educated in France. Under his auspices was erected a rude log-chapel, dedicated to the Holy Cross, with unglazed windows, and a rough hewn slab of wood by way of an altar, the first Catholic place of worship in Kentucky.

The second, dedicated in 1798 by Fathers Badin and Fournier, missionaries sent by Bishop Carroll some years previously, was St. Ann's on Cartwright's Creek, which later contained the largest body of Catholic worshippers in the State. The nucleus of its congregation was formed by Thomas Hill and Henry Cambron, who left Maryland in 1787 and 1788 respectively. Hill, the first to start was the last to arrive, as his boats were attacked by Indians on the river, some twenty miles from Fort Nelson,

now Louisville, a negro servant, together with all his horses, being killed. He, himself, severely wounded by a musket ball of an ounce weight, which passed through both his legs, was obliged to suspend his journey at Bardstown, whence, after two years, he moved on to join his friend. The occupation of contiguous farms enabled them to combine their labours in the erection of the log-chapel, which, afterwards transferred to the Dominicans, and known as St. Rose's, was ultimately pulled down in 1806. Father Fournier, one of its first incumbents, was accidentally killed in 1803 by the falling of a log while working in a saw-mill, and left his surviving colleague in sole charge of a vast district. The nearest missionary priest in one direction was Father Donatien Olivier, at Prairie du Rocher, Illinois, and Father Gabriel Richard, at Detroit, Michigan, was the only other in the whole north-west. States originally Catholic were no better off, and Louisiana, inhabited by the descendants of Spaniards and Frenchmen, was almost without priests.

In Kentucky the Catholic flocks continued to multiply apace, and within thirteen years the first log-chapel had become the parent of twenty churches, and the 700 families who then represented Catholicity had grown to 7000, numbering some 13,000 individuals. Among other immigrants came a community of refugee Trappists from France, the vocation of whose prior, Father Marie Joseph Dunand, had been determined by a striking incident. Originally a soldier, he was serving as a grenadier in the Revolutionary army, when, ordered to shoot a priest, and refusing to do so, he fled the ranks to become a Religious, and end his days in a discipline more austere than that he left. The Trappist settlement proved abortive; they were broken up by illness, and after removing to Missouri, finally returned to Europe.

It was about the same time that Father Nerinckx arrived, with other exiles of the Revolution, to take his part in the evangelization of a new continent. The son of a prosperous physician, born in 1761, at Herffelingen, in Brabant, he developed an early vocation for the priesthood, and was serving as parish priest of Everberg Neerbeke, in his native province, when the great political cyclone swept him, with so many other human atoms, from his peaceful routine of duty. On his refusal, in 1797, to take the oath prescribed for the clergy, a mandate was issued for his arrest, from which he escaped by a nocturnal flight in the disguise of a peasant to Dendermonde. There he remained in hiding for four years, the Hospital of St. Blaise, in charge of twelve Hospitaller nuns, of whom his aunt, Mother Constantia Langendries was one, furnishing him with an asylum. Here all clerical ministrations to the wounded and dying were performed

by night, and Mass said at 2 A.M. A seeming clothes-press in his room masked an unsuspected intramural recess, into which he disappeared on the alarm of danger, and a disused hen-coop in the farmyard served the same friendly purpose if he was surprised while walking in the grounds. The secret of the latter refuge was betrayed by himself on one occasion, when, overhearing the blasphemous language of one of the workmen, he could not restrain his indignation, and stepped out to rebuke him. Not content with this, he insisted on his dismissal, though thereby exposing himself to the risk of a vengeance as sure as it was obvious. It is to the credit of human nature that the man failed to avail himself of his opportunity, and the Father's retreat remained undiscovered.

In 1801, when the actual persecution ceased, he chose expatriation in preference to taking the oath to the Republican Government, and, after a tedious voyage to America, eventually reached the scene of his apostolic labours in Kentucky in 1805. One of the first results of his presence was the building of the little church of St. Charles, on Hardin's Creek, in the following year, by the primitive method of co-operation then in vogue in the backwoods. The members of the congregation having agreed to supply each one or more hewn logs of prescribed dimensions, the "house raising," as it was called, was effected on a given day by the combined efforts of all. In this part of the task the Father's great bodily strength enabled him to play a conspicuous part, wielding the handspike with such effect as to counterbalance at one end of a log the united forces of two men at the other. This log church, the fourth erected in Kentucky, subsisted until 1832, when it was replaced by a brick building.

Physical, no less than spiritual, endowments were, indeed, part of the qualifications for missionary life in those days. Father Nerinckx's district, comprising nearly half the State of Kentucky, now furnishes thirty congregations, and it was part of his ordinary routine to ride twenty-five or thirty miles in order to hear confessions and say mass, breaking his fast only at three or four in the afternoon. Sick calls entailed still longer journeys, and on his famous horse "Printer" he had sometimes to travel 150 miles in a ride of a day and two nights. On one occasion, after accomplishing eighty miles in twenty-four hours, he arrived only to find that the dread rider on the white horse had sped more swiftly still. His penitent was dead at the door of his cabin, whither he had been carried in order to watch for the approach of the priest.

These journeys were accomplished through an inhospitable wilderness, where rivers had to be swum or forded, and to dangers by flood and field were added those from the beasts of the

forest. Benighted once in a wood, he was pursued by wolves, and had to pass the night in the saddle, surrounded by the ravenous pack. Once or twice, when they showed a disposition to spring on his horse, he gave himself up for lost, but by his shouts and resolute demeanour succeeded in keeping them at bay till morning.

By his personal prowess he once obtained a decisive though bloodless victory over a noted bully of the district, who waylaid, and intended to beat him. The meek submission with which the missionary dismounted in obedience to his summons led him to believe that the execution of his programme would be an easy matter, but when he proceeded to put it into action, he found himself quietly pinioned by a pair of stalwart arms, laid helpless on the ground, and held there until he pleaded for release, and promised amendment. On another occasion, when riding with a party of backwoodsmen, Father Nerinckx gave them a lesson of courtesy, by returning the salutation of an old coloured man. "I do not wish to be beaten in politeness by a negro," was his reply, when scoffed at by his companions for the act.

He is honoured as the Founder of the first female community in Kentucky, developed from the spontaneous association in 1812 of some young ladies, in a common life of usefulness, a log-hut with the scantiest and rudest household appliances being their first shelter. They took the name of Friends of Mary at the Foot of the Cross, but the Order which had, in 1879, 26 branches with 288 sisters and 52 novices, is generally known as that of Little Loretto.

Father Nerinckx encountered much opposition in the latter years of his life, as a part of his congregation resented the austere discipline suited to the early simplicity of settler habits, but difficult to enforce on a more advanced community. His life's work was done when the foundations of the pioneer Church were laid, and to others was left the easier task of building on that substructure. But the pious legend that the church bells of all his missions in Kentucky rang spontaneously on the night of his death, which occurred during a journey in Missouri, showed how reverently his memory was cherished in the hearts of his people at large.

Another striking figure of the same early period of the Church is that of Prince Demetrius Gallitzin, the heir of a great Russian house, who, sent to America by his parents on a tour of pleasure, was there seized with a vocation for the priesthood, and remained to devote himself to its evangelization. He is known as the Apostle of the Alleghanies, the chosen field of his labours, where in the little settlement of Loretto, his own creation and foundation, he spent the latter part of his life.

Ecclesiastical organization had meantime proceeded hand in hand with geographical extension, and the vast diocese of Baltimore, which included the whole of the United States south of the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, stretching from Michigan to Florida, and from Maine to the Missouri, with some of the West India Islands thrown in as appanages, had its dimensions curtailed in every direction. In addition to the See of New Orleans already existing, four suffragan dioceses—Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Bardstown—were created in 1808, Dr. Carroll being raised to the rank of Archbishop. Even these sub-divisions of the original See were of vast extent, and that of Bardstown in Kentucky embraced the area of seven and a half States and two territories, now constituting ten dioceses. The first Provincial Council of Baltimore, summoned to meet in 1829 marked an epoch in the growth of the Church when common deliberation became necessary in order to secure uniformity of discipline. Its sittings, attended by five bishops under the presidency of the Metropolitan of Baltimore, resulted in the adoption of 38 Decrees, subsequently sanctioned by Rome.

The second Council, held in 1837, devoted much of its time to the discussion of missions to the negroes of Liberia and the Indians of the north-west. Both were confided to the Jesuits, who undertook the charge with alacrity. Among the Indians they resumed the missions commenced by Joques and Menard, and retained them until 1850, when one of their number was raised to the Episcopate, and the Indian territory made a Vicariate Apostolic.

During the following years Provincial Councils were not only held in Baltimore at intervals of four or five years, but also in the other ecclesiastical provinces into which the original arch-diocese was gradually sub-divided. Their Decrees, however, though sanctioned by the Holy See, had only local binding force, and, what is termed in politics federation, was required in order to create a central authority, capable of legislating for the whole American Church. This was brought about by the agreement of the prelates of the United States to hold periodical National Councils, whose resolutions should be accepted by all.

The result of the movement [says the *New York Catholic News*] was that a summons was issued to the Bishops of the United States to meet in the Cathedral Church of the city of Baltimore on May 9th, 1852, for the discussion of questions affecting the interests of the Church in this country. No such gathering had been before witnessed in the history of the American Church. Among its attendants were six archbishops and twenty-six bishops, all of whom were presided over by the Most Rev. Francis Kenrick, who had been transferred from the See of Philadelphia only a few years before. The entire episcopacy

was present, from the Archbishop of Baltimore to the Bishop of Monterey, who had to travel across the continent. The Council was in session for a number of days, and the principal result of its labours was a request to the Holy See to establish eight new bishoprics, to raise San Francisco to an archiepiscopate, and to constitute Upper Michigan a Vicariate Apostolic. This increase of the episcopacy was rendered necessary by the rapid growth of the Catholic population. Bishops no longer found themselves able to attend to the requirements of a large district, for the population had become concentrated, and the trading posts of fifty years before had grown into promising cities. The calls for episcopal ministrations were so many that the increase in the number of bishops was fully justified by the exigencies of the times. The Pastoral Letter of the Council was prepared by Archbishop Kenrick. It abounds in good counsels, and directions to Catholics for their proper conduct, and has been characterized by many as the most truly Apostolic document that ever emanated from such a body. The Decrees of the Council were, with some slight amendment, approved by the Roman Congregations, and the approval returned in the following year in an Apostolic Letter of the Holy Father.

It had been originally intended that a National Council of the bishops of the United States should be held every ten years. In 1862, when the time came for the second Plenary Council, the country was in the midst of internecine strife. At the close of the war, preparations were made for the postponed assembly. Archbishop Spalding was then the successor of Archbishop Carroll. He was the son of one of the oldest families of Maryland. After some years of study in the seminary of Bardstown, Kentucky, he was sent to Rome to study theology and philosophy. Made coadjutor to the Bishop of Louisville in 1848, he succeeded Bishop Flaget on that prelate's death in 1850. On the death of the Archbishop of Baltimore in 1860 he was elected by Papal Rescript to that position in the American Church. It was he who was appointed Apostolic Delegate to the Second Plenary Council held in 1866. The Council was opened by six archbishops, thirty-seven bishops, three mitred abbots, and the representatives of thirteen religious bodies, followed by upwards of one hundred theologians. The solemn sessions of the Council were conducted on a scale of great magnificence, while in the private sessions the questions engrossing the attention of the prelates are said to have been discussed with much judgment. It was not long before the Decrees of the Council received their binding force from Rome, and at the Vatican Council of 1869 they were referred to as monuments of the correct judgment and thorough learning of those who took part in their formulation. They are unique in ecclesiastical legislation, and in all cases exhibit a desire on the part of the legislators to conform as far as possible with the usage of the Church on all points.

At this Council was enunciated the desire for a Catholic University, the execution of which was left to the next great ecclesiastical gathering of the same character. The most striking

result of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1884, was the first active step towards the realization of the project by the creation of a committee of prelates and laymen, with the Archbishop of Baltimore at its head, to collect and administer the funds necessary for the purpose. Thus, each of these assemblies has left its mark upon the history of the Church in the practical measures resulting from its deliberations.

The increasing importance of Catholicism as an element in the life of the nation at large may be estimated by the subjoined comparative table of its numerical growth, side by side with that of the general population :—

	1776	1790	1800	1810	1820
Catholic Population	25,000	30,000	100,000	150,000	300,000
Total Population ...	3,000,000	3,200,000	5,300,000	7,200,000	9,600,000
Fraction ... ...	$\frac{1}{120}$	$\frac{1}{107}$	$\frac{5}{3}$	$\frac{1}{48}$	$\frac{1}{32}$
	1830	1840	1850	1860	1878
Catholic Population	600,000	1,500,000	3,500,000	4,500,000	7,000,000
Total Population ...	13,000,000	17,000,000	23,200,000	31,500,000	40,000,000
Fraction ... ...	$\frac{1}{21}$	$\frac{1}{11}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{7}$	$\frac{1}{6}$

The progressive ratio of growth borne by the wealth of the Church to that of the country is shown below, for the period 1850-70 :—

	1850	1860	1870
	\$	\$	\$
United States . . .	7,135,780,228	16,159,616,068	30,668,518,507
Catholic Church. . .	9,256,758	26,774,119	60,985,565

Thus, while the aggregate wealth of the country increased, during the first decade 125, and that of the Church 189 per cent., the figures for the second are 86 and 128 respectively.

The increase of the Catholic population is not entirely due to immigration from Europe, but to annexation of territory and inter-continental migration as well. Under this last head comes the increasing movement of French-Canadians across the international boundary, reckoned during the last thirty years at 500,000. Under the former must be counted the purchase of Florida in 1819, with 18,000 Catholic inhabitants of Spanish descent, and the annexations in 1845 and 1848 of Texas, California, and New Mexico, with an aggregate population, also originally Spanish, of 160,000. The aboriginal race, out of a total of 279,333, numbers 106,000 Catholics, according to the statistics of the Indian Bureau for 1875, while the coloured people furnish to the Church a contingent from 25,000 to 30,000 strong. Father Hecker\* estimates the German Catholics at

\* "Catholic Church in the United States." Rev. J. T. Hecker. New York, 1879.

1,237,563, but the rapid increase in the total since 1846 has been mainly due to the great movement westward of the Irish population, commencing with the famine year. Archbishop Ryan, in preaching the centenary sermon in Baltimore Cathedral, dwelt on the recent rapid growth of Catholicism in the old Puritan States, where hostility to it was greatest. Here, where sixty years ago, there was but one bishop with two priests and two places of worship, there are now one archbishop, six bishops, 942 priests, and 619 churches, with private chapels, colleges, schools, and benevolent institutions in proportion. The statistics of the Church at large are given in Cardinal Gibbons' "Pastoral on the Centenary."

There is now [he says] embraced within the territory of the United States a Catholic population of about 9,000,000. There are 13 archbishops and 71 bishops, 8000 priests, 10,500 churches and chapels, 27 seminaries exclusively devoted to the training of candidates for the sacred ministry; there are 650 colleges and academies for the higher education of the youth of both sexes, and 3100 parish schools. There are 520 hospitals and orphan asylums, where every form of human misery and infirmity is alleviated, and where children of both sexes are rescued from spiritual and temporal wretchedness, and are reared to become useful and honourable members of society.

In an interesting article on "Roman Catholicism in America," by Mr. Bodley, in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, 1889, the writer graphically illustrates the progress of the Church in the United States by dwelling on its position in a single city.

Philadelphia [he says], unlike New York, is a typical American commercial city which illustrates the position and progress of the Roman Catholic Church in the Union. Although the estimable Society of Friends is not so relatively strong there as formerly, and though Pennsylvania was in the old days a favourable locality for Catholic settlers, yet the tradition of Philadelphia is decidedly Protestant. For all that, the "Quaker City" contains nearly as many Roman Catholics as the entire population of Rome. It contains more Catholics than the entire population of any other town in Catholic Italy, except Naples; of any town in Catholic Spain, but Madrid; of any town in Catholic Belgium but Brussels; and of any town in France except Paris and Lyons. Among the great Catholic cities of Europe, whose inhabitants are less numerous than the Catholic population of Philadelphia are Milan, Turin, Palermo, Barcelona, Antwerp, Bordeaux, and Marseilles. Statements in this form are frequently made to illustrate the vastness of London, but Philadelphia is not even a London on a small scale. It is a characteristic American city of the first rank, larger than any single British municipality in the provinces, but not much larger than Manchester and Salford, together with the adjoining townships, and it contains over 300,000

Catholics. The next census will probably show that this figure is considerably below the mark, as the diocese contains 400,000 Catholics, and there is no great centre of population within it outside Philadelphia.

The approach of the Centennial anniversary of the foundation of the hierarchy gave a peculiar fitness to the work set on foot by the Plenary Council of 1884 in the creation of a Catholic University. No worthier monument could be raised to the past triumph of the Church than one so tending to secure its future progress. Nowhere is Catholicism so fully in touch with modern ideas as in the United States, where the problem of reconciling religious authority with the spirit of modern democracy has been fully and finally solved. But the Catholic body, in order to maintain its position in a world dominated by the progressive theories of the present day must be provided with such complete machinery of education as shall secure knowledge according to the highest prevailing standard, without sacrifice of faith. To this necessity the American public has shown itself fully alive, and the magnitude of the subscriptions was commensurate with the greatness of the end to be attained. First on the list came Miss Caldwell, with the munificent offering of 300,000 dollars (£60,000), to which her sister added £10,000. Four other subscribers followed with £10,000, £4000, £2800, and £2000 respectively, the general scale of contribution being so large that the sum of £155,540 was collected from 41 persons, while lesser offerings mounted up to £6800. Thus, in October, 1886, the American Episcopate was in a position to request the sanction of Rome for their undertaking, to which full authorization was given in a letter from the Pope to Cardinal Gibbons, tracing in outline the constitution of the new foundation.

The spiritual basis of the University having been thus established, the erection of its material structure rapidly followed. A large piece of ground near the City of Washington having been purchased for a site, the foundation stone of the Divinity School was laid on May 28th, 1888, in presence of Cardinal Gibbons, 25 other prelates, 500 ecclesiastics, and 5000 invited guests—among whom were President Cleveland and five members of his Cabinet.

As celestial patrons of the University Our Lady and St. Thomas Aquinas have been chosen by its rector, Dr. John J. Keane, Bishop of Richmond, born in Ireland, in the county of Donegal, in 1839. He has qualified himself for his charge by visiting the principal European Universities—those of Rome, Vienna, Munich, Münster, Paris, and Louvain, whose teaching he made the subject of comparative treatises. For the teaching

staff he has already chosen, as professor of moral philosophy, Dr. Bouquillon, a noted writer on the subject; of Biblical studies, Dr. Hyvernat, a native of Lyons, and disciple of the celebrated Professor Vigouroux, of Paris; of canon law, Dr. Messmer, a native of Switzerland, but for many years resident in America; of dogmatic theology, Dr. Schröder, author of standard works on the subject, born at Beeck in 1849; and of Thomistic philosophy, Dr. Pohle, born in 1852 at Niederspay on the Rhine, eminent as a writer and contributor to erudite ecclesiastical compilations.

The course will consist, for the present, of lectures every day on dogmatic and moral theology, the Holy Scriptures, and higher philosophy; three times a week on English literature; and once a week on ecclesiastical history, liturgy, and various scientific subjects. Later on will be instituted courses of Biblical languages, as well as of sacred music and church ceremonies. The University is intended to consist, when completed, of seven great blocks of building, of which those assigned to the schools of law and medicine will be immediately erected.

So rapid was the construction of the Divinity Building as to make its completion the visible monument of the centennial of the hierarchy, and its inauguration the central event of the celebration. The imposing festivities, of which that ceremonial formed a part, have roused the world to a sudden consciousness of the conquests of Catholicism in a new sphere. But such an occasion can be fittingly celebrated only if its triumphant retrospect be linked with an equal promise of anticipated achievement, and its memorial foundation should be as a milestone facing both ways, recording on the one side the progress of the past, and pointing on the other to the work still remaining for the future. The Washington University will be such a reminder, marking the determination of all who profess Catholicism in America that its second century shall be at least as fruitful as its first. For the Church, conformably to her militant character on earth, can never afford to rest in the consciousness of a completed task, but must ever gird herself to fresh action. Movement and progress are the necessary conditions of her divinely bestowed vitality, as they are of that of more purely human institutions. For the main trunk, indeed, they can never fail, but in the secondary branches their diminution would indicate loss of vigour, and decay would be the Nemesis of sterility.

Nor can the policy of geographical isolation proclaimed by the State in America be ever adopted by a section of that body among whose chief titles to authority is her universality. The Transatlantic Church cannot separate herself from the wants and strivings of the greater community to which she belongs, but must do her share in the work of the Church as a whole. The

consolidation and development of her own organism has fully occupied her energies during the first century of her growth, but the second should see her, fully matured and firmly rooted, prepared to transmit to others the light she has herself received.

Nay, she is, perhaps, in a more especial manner than others called to this task, since it is for her pre-eminently one of expiation. The African slave trade, initiated by the demand for labour in the American colonies, lies heavy at the door of her flock, and entails an obligation of atonement to the race to which has been done the most grievous wrong ever suffered by humanity. Already it has wreaked, in sanguinary civil war, a dire retribution on the continent that gave it birth, while the threatening aspect of the negro question, looming large among the difficulties of the future, seems to show that its inheritance of evil is not yet exhausted.

But even this great blot on the record of mankind may be yet effaced, if it be made the means of working out the redemption of the lost African race by the nation primarily responsible for its enslavement. The evangelization of the great heathen continent, now for the first time rendered practically possible, is the largest task set the coming generation; and the Anglo-Saxon race, with whom lies the world's future, should, if true to its position, bear the heaviest part in it. It will be at best a slow growth of time, impeded by material obstacles, for while missionaries have been, and will be, found ready to die in the attempt to plant the Cross in the equatorial wilderness, white colonization, giving a wider scope to the contact between religious influences and barbarism, is throughout its vast extent a physical impossibility. But if the European races are thus excluded, their place might be taken by the Christianized negroes of North America, fitted for the requirements of African colonization at once by affinity of blood, linking them to their heathen kinsfolk, and, by hereditary tendency of constitution, enabling them to work and thrive in a climate enervating or deadly to the natives of the temperate zone. The increase of the coloured population, raising a problem for the future of the United States, would here find a profitable outlet, and the original violent deportation of the negro would be atoned for, if utilized as a means of leavening with civilizing influences the 210,000,000 Pagans yet unreclaimed in Africa.

A step towards these results has already been taken in the opening by St. Joseph's Foreign Missionary Society of a college in Baltimore during the great celebrations of the Centenary, for the education of missionaries, both of European and African descent, exclusively devoted to the conversion of the coloured race. The negroes of America, among whom there are already from 25,000 to

30,000 Catholics, are the first objects of its solicitude, but the prosecution of this task is intended to be but preparatory to the larger one of the evangelization of the parent stock. The adoption of the work as a national one on a more extended scale would be a worthy result of the Baltimore Congress, and a fitting consecration of the second century of American Catholicism. Wonderful as has been its past, a future still more wonderful may await it in the infusion of fresh Transatlantic vigour which it may be destined to impart to the missionary work of the Church at large. Over 100,000 Indians already gathered to its fold testify to its proselytizing power, with such increase even to their material well-being, as is testified to by the concurring testimony of all travellers. The success that has attended the efforts of American Catholics in this quarter should encourage them to invade that still greater domain of heathenism, whose conquest to the Cross is, perhaps, reserved for them as a visible atonement for the sins of their fathers against it. The material prosperity of their happy continent makes their obligation all the greater to succour that most miserable one, the slave-raider's prey and the fiends' paradise, which awaits a double redemption at the hands of the more favoured peoples of the earth.

The call to enter upon this work has been already recognized by the Protestant sects in America, and the foundation, some seventy years ago, of the American Colonization Society for the Regeneration of Africa proclaimed its purpose in its name. Its outcome was the creation of Liberia, a settlement of freed negroes on the west coast of Africa, where they and their descendants now number 40,000, and rule over some two million of native African subjects. That a similar system, carried out by a Catholic association for the conversion of Africa, would be likely to be attended with still larger results, is the belief of even Protestant writers, and we quote, to this effect, Dr. E. J. Blyden, who at one time represented the Negro Republic of Liberia at the Court of St. James's :—

Another plan of propagating religion in Africa through indigenous agency is followed by no Christian Church with greater zeal and determination than the Church of Rome. That Church, ever ready to recognize and utilize those elements in human nature which can be made subservient to her interests, is now everywhere educating Africans for the African work. We are convinced that the only hopeful and effective way of proceeding in respect to Africa is that which may be summed up in the words—the conversion of Africa by the Africans. Christian black settlements ought to be attempted all over Africa, even, if need be, among the Mohammedans, after the difficult and costly manner followed by Monsignor Comboni. The task is full of hardship, but no other system will avail. Whether it will be possible to organize bands of the Catholic Africano-Americans for

the settlement and conversion of Africa—as their Protestant brethren, who sail to Liberia in numbers varying annually from two to five hundred, are organized for that very purpose—remains to be proved. Large funds are required—hard heads and generous hearts to carry out such an enterprise; but genuine faith, hope, and charity are divine and creative forces, and we must look for great results where they exist, and are brought into energetic action.

The connecting link between Africa and the outer world will thus be supplied by the American coloured race, sent back as messengers of civilization to their outcast kindred. Great tracts of the most fertile regions of the earth lie derelict, depopulated by the slave trade, awaiting inhabitants sufficiently advanced in arts and knowledge to be able to cope with the exterminators of their kind. We do not despair of seeing the day when these slaughter-scarred areas shall be transformed into so many Catholic Liberias, true oases of freedom and faith scattered through the barbarian wilds. The realization of such a dream would, doubtless, be a heavy task, but none too heavy for American energy and enthusiasm. Its fulfilment would make the coming century worthy of that which is past, by crowning the second cycle of the Transatlantic Church with the redemption of another continent.

EDITORIAL.

---

## Science Notices.

---

**The Photographic Chart of the Heavens.**—The Holy Father has given one more proof of his disinterested love of learning, and of the elasticity of mind which enables him, in the midst of innumerable cares, to share, in full sympathy, all the nobler aspirations of humanity. Within the walls of the palace which is his prison, he has decreed the erection of an astronomical observatory, already, at his instance, enrolled among those co-operating in the great international work of charting the heavens by photography. The instrument required for the purpose has been ordered from the MM. Henry, of Paris, and will doubtless be executed with all possible despatch. It may be described as a twin-telescope, a single tube enclosing a refractor of thirteen inches aperture, at the focus of which the sensitive plates are exposed, and a refractor of eleven inches for the visual use of the operator, whose business it is to keep the stars steady during the operation. The photographic object-glass is as unfit for looking through, as the visual object-glass for taking photographs with, for the simple reason that each is constructed to concentrate into an image the different qualities of light to which the human and the chemical retinas are respectively sensitive. There may be insects which see best, or solely, with the high-up rays that blacken salts of silver; but our own species needs the help of longer and less frequent vibrations.

Father Denza of the Barnabite Order, for some years the head of the observatory at Moncalieri near Turin, has been nominated by the Pope director of the Vatican establishment, and as such is now a member of the Permanent Committee charged with carrying out the resolutions of the Photographic Congress of 1887. The French Astronomical Society marked their esteem for him personally, no less than their appreciation of the service to science he has been chosen to render, by electing him, on the 6th of last November, an honorary member of their body. The meeting of the Permanent Committee at Paris in September 1889, was in every respect satisfactory. Some important decisions were arrived at; others, less pressing and more likely to divide opinions, were wisely reserved for future consideration; technical points were discussed and elucidated; proposals, hitherto vague, received a tangible form; and the whole work, notwithstanding the novelties of principle and detail met with at every stage of its organization, was notably facilitated and quickened. Twenty observatories, distributed over the wide range of latitude from Helsingfors to the Cape of Good Hope, have now engaged to share its practical execution. Of these, fifteen are expected to be completely equipped early in the present year; and the five recently added—at Vienna, Catania, Manilla, Tacubaya in Mexico, and the Vatican—will be ready by its close. Each will have to take about seven hundred photographs, in the

special zone of the heavens assigned to it, by methods and employing precautions accurately prescribed by the Congress; and the results will eventually be sent in to a central office, where measurements, reductions, and reproductions will be carried into effect on a uniform plan. It is somewhat remarkable that no co-operating observatory is to be found within the compass of the United States. American astronomers prefer acting on their own account, and it must be admitted they do so with great vigour and success.

**The Solar Eclipses of 1889.**—The elaborate modern machinery for eclipse-observation was, for the first time in 1889, set in motion twice in a single year. The opportunity for such a feat does not often occur; and it is only of late that astronomers have felt it incumbent upon them to transport themselves and their complex and delicate apparatus to the ends of the earth for the purposes of a spectacle which an unlucky drift of cloud during a given three minutes may completely efface. Their admirable energy has, on the whole, some poignant disappointments notwithstanding, been amply rewarded. We owe to observations made during, or suggested by total eclipses, all the knowledge we possess about the immediate appendages of the sun.

The track of totality on January 1, 1889, crossed none but American soil, and a kind of "Monro doctrine" regarding it seems to have been tacitly allowed to prevail. There was no European interference with the local monopoly of the phenomenon. American observers had it all to themselves, and showed their superiority to recent English expeditionary parties in this, if in nothing else, that they managed, unlike a certain Lowland barometer in meteorological adversity, to "keep some power over the weather!" Nothing indeed could be better than the way in which the work was done. Although the eclipse, as visible from Mount Hamilton, fell short of being total, the Lick Observatory was the centre of the organization by which a great part of the results were secured; a field-station in connection with it at Bartlett Springs, California, was manned by Lick observers, Mr. J. E. Keeler at their head; and documents and photographs innumerable were after the event, transmitted to Lick for discussion, comparison, and appraisement. The prompt publication of the volume embodying this mass of more or less valuable information, has been set off by the slightly *subsequent* appearance of our Royal Society's Report upon the eclipse of 1886. In a careful introduction, Professor Holden reaches the following, among other conclusions: "That the characteristic coronal forms seem to vary periodically as the sun spots (and auroras) vary in frequency, and that the coronas of 1867, 1878, and 1889, are of the same strongly marked type, which corresponds therefore to an epoch of minimum solar activity." This type, as our readers may be aware, is distinguished by the substitution for the ordinary "aigrettes" of coronal radiance, of huge equatorial wing-like streamers, accompanied by polar luminosity of the "brush" or hairy kind. Now we learn in addition (and the fact is of great significance), "that the so-called

'polar' rays exist at all latitudes on the sun's surface, and are better seen at the poles of the sun simply because they are there projected against the dark background of the sky, and not against the equatorial extensions of the outer corona." The surface of the sun, in fact, bristles all over with light resembling somewhat the "aura" that may be seen to accompany an electrical spark passed across a powerful magnetic field. The definitive establishment of the relations first indicated by Mr. Ranyard some years ago, between coronal forms and the variations of solar activity, though the main result of the eclipse of January 1, 1889, was not its sole one. Important observations were besides made upon the photometric intensity of the corona, tending (it was thought) to invalidate Dr. Huggins's method of photographing it in full sunshine, and upon its spectrum, suggesting the admissibility of much narrower limits than those hitherto adopted for the sun's gaseous surroundings. Both these points, however, require fuller investigation than they have yet received. The frontispiece of the volume issued from Lick consists of an exquisite "silver-print" from a photograph taken by Mr. Barnard. It represents "the absolutely autographic record of the eclipse."

For the eclipse of December 22, 1889, an almost exclusively photographic mode of attack was decided upon, with the object of determining, as far as possible, the real nature of the coronal "extensions." The comparison of plates exposed by Father Perry at the Salut Islands, and by Mr. Taylor on the West Coast of Africa, sixty miles south of Loanda, may at least (as Mr. Turner remarks in No. 155 of the "Observatory") settle the point "whether the photographed corona changes perceptibly in two hours and a half." But it remains to be seen how much of the *visual* corona, of the particular type now existing, can be photographed. Hitherto, only the *roots* of the great equatorial "wings," had been chemically depicted; to get them complete, instruments of augmented light-grasp were needed, which should still be portable enough for distant transportation and temporary use. These Mr. Common has supplied in two perfectly similar reflecting telescopes, which by their excessively short focal length of only forty-five inches, combined with an aperture of twenty inches, give images of unexampled brilliancy. Their power is shown by the considerably nebulous appearance of the Pleiades on a plate exposed with one of them during the brief interval of thirty minutes, the earth-lit portion of the moon coming out with some detail in two or three. As to the upshot of their performance with the corona, something will have been learned by telegraph before these lines are issued from the press.\* It is to be hoped that at least they will get fair play from the weather, through which

The best laid schemes o' mice an' men  
Gang aft a-gley.

---

\* The sorrowful result of the death of Father Perry, on December 27, at the Salut Islands, is the only one of which we are yet assured.

**The Rotation of Mercury.**—The first discovery throwing any genuine light upon the physical condition of the planet Mercury, has been announced by Signor Schiaparelli, the illustrious director of the Brera Observatory at Milan. After ten years' watching, he has at last caught the secret of its method of rotation. It is that peculiar one imposed by the tide-raising power of the earth upon the moon, and prevailing also, there is reason to believe, among the satellites of Jupiter and Saturn. Notoriously, the moon always keeps the same face turned towards the earth; we see round the corner into the averted hemisphere only to a small extent under favour of the inequalities of movement, and changes of perspective-position known as "librations." This monotony of aspect arises, of course, from the absolute identity between the lunar periods of rotation and revolution; and the same curious relation is now found to connect Mercury's axial with his orbital movement. Each is performed in eighty-eight days; so that one of the planet's hemispheres remains perpetually exposed to a glare of sunshine nearly sever times more powerful than can ever fall upon the earth, while the other is plunged in unending night. Signor Schiaparelli believes that the appalling contrast of temperatures suggested by this arrangement, may be modified by the rapid circulation of an atmosphere shown by the spectroscope to contain a goodly proportion of water-vapour; still, the presence of any form of life on a globe so strangely circumstanced, is extremely difficult to conceive.

But all this may have been otherwise in the past. It is the mark, we are led to suppose, of an effete world to have surrendered so much of its velocity of rotation as "tidal friction" can deprive it of. In this way only can we explain, with any probability, the unifacial character, as regards their primaries, of many dependent bodies. Ancient tidal waves, raised in their molten masses, *ground down* their primitive whirling to the exact point needed for the abolition of resistance. For with the equalization of rotation and revolution the tidal protuberance became fixed, and friction ceased. Thus it has happened to the moon; thus it has seemingly happened to Mercury; thus (should no other design of Providence intervene) the earth itself must fare, if its oceans last long enough for the slow, inevitable effect of their ebblings and flowings to be consummated. First, by *lunar* tidal friction, the day will be lengthened to a month; then again, by *solar* tidal friction, the protracted day will be further extended to a year; and our planet, desolated by frost on one side, by fire on the other, will be reduced to the plight of its least sister, the evasive star of early twilight.

**"The Identity of Light and Electricity."**—In a recent number we mentioned the researches of Dr. Hertz, which have proved the identity of light and electricity. Last September, Dr. Hertz, in an address to the Congress of German Naturalists at Heidelberg, described the experiments upon which he bases this important conclusion. Dr. Hertz, by his own admission, is not the author of

the theory, but it has fallen to his lot to prove its truth. Its originator was undoubtedly Faraday, who, by that intuition so peculiarly his own, felt that light, electricity, and magnetism were produced by motions of the same medium—the ether of space. But in vain did he try and determine whether the transmission of electric and magnetic forces was instantaneous or not. Maxwell, by his mathematical formulae, strengthened the position of the etherial theory ; but experimental evidence was still wanting. This Dr. Hertz has supplied. To prove experimentally in the laboratory that electrical propagation is not instantaneous was no easy task, considering the rate at which electric waves travel. To quote Dr. Hertz's words : "It is impossible to observe the excitation of a magnet, the discharge of a Leyden jar, &c., at anything but a moderate distance, say, 10 metres. Now, light and electricity according to the theory, traverse this space in one millionth of a second."

The method of observation adopted by Dr. Hertz was as follows :— On the discharge of a Leyden jar electric oscillations take place. A single vibration can be therefore taken as a sort of unit. But as the shortest vibrations are of the order of a million a second, the effect of one of these vibrations is propagated to a distance of 300 metres during its existence, and within the bounds of a laboratory cause and effect will be simultaneous. Fortunately, another method was found. It was discovered that "not only is a Leyden jar discharge oscillatory, but that oscillations take place in any conductor in the vicinity, and that these oscillations are far more rapid than those of the Leyden jar, being of the order of from 100 to 1000 million per second." From this time Dr. Hertz possessed signals whose duration was comparable with a thirty-millionth of a second ; he says, however, that they would have been of little use if he had been unable to seize them, so to speak, at a distance of only 10 metres. The means Dr. Hertz employed were very simple. At the spot where he wished to observe the signal, he placed a conductor in the shape of a rectilinear wire containing a slight interruption. When the electric field varied rapidly a tiny spark was seen at the opening. These sparks are about the  $\frac{1}{100}$  of a millimetre in length. Their duration is less than a millionth of a second. When the conductor is placed at certain points of the room, sparking is violent, while at other points it is extinguished. Dr. Hertz noticed that the places of electrical activity and inactivity succeeded each other in regular order, and so could affirm that the propagation was not instantaneous. He was able to measure the wave length. Then the question arose, whether the waves were longitudinal or transverse. To decide this question, Dr. Hertz placed his conductor in two positions at the same spot. In one there was electrical excitation, in the other none. This showed that the waves were transverse. The next problem was the speed of the propagation. This was solved by multiplying the wave length by the duration of the vibration. Dr. Hertz found a velocity approximating that of light. Subsequent experiments confirm these conclusions.

To those who still doubt [says Dr. Hertz], I would point out that every effect which is observed with light waves can be observed with these electric waves. If the conductor is placed in the focus of a large concave mirror, the electric waves unite and leave the mirror in the form of a rectilinear pencil. By turning this mirror we can send the ray in different directions. When we interpose in its path conducting bodies, the electric ray is stopped, but not destroyed, since it is reflected. To study the refraction of light we employ a prism. The same can be done for electricity, only the dimensions of the waves and of the ray oblige us to use as a conductor a very large prism. Moreover, it is necessary to choose a cheap substance, such as pitch or asphalt. Finally, it is possible to observe with the electric ray, phenomena, which, up to the present, have only been observed in the case of light namely, those of polarization.

Dr. Hertz points out that these discoveries will cause our electric phraseology to be much modified. In the future we must not speak of currents traversing conductors, "we must speak only of undulations crossing space, separating, assisting each other, or reinforcing each other. The domain of optics is no longer limited to undulations only a fraction of a millimetre in length ; it comprises waves whose length may be measured in decimetres, metres, and kilometres." But we may well venture to think that not only the language but the practice also of electrical science will become greatly changed. Are there not startling possibilities in store—for instance, will material conductors such as wires be necessary for the transmission of electricity ? In telegraphing the return wire was found to be an unnecessary complication. Is there really need of a continuous wire at all ? It is said that Mr. Edison is at work at the problem of the transmission of sight to a distance. Perhaps Dr. Hertz's researches may strike the key-note of its solution. Well may Dr. Oliver Lodge say in his "Modern Views of Electricity" : "The present is an epoch of astounding activity in physical science. Progress is a thing of months and weeks, almost of days. The long line of isolated ripples of past discovery seem blending into a mighty wave, on the crest of which one begins to discern some on-coming magnificent generalization. The suspense is becoming feverish, at times almost painful." But before we can master the ether of space we must know more of its structure and nature than we do at present. Dr. Hertz, in the concluding remarks of his address, says that the modern physicist will soon ask whether all material things are not modifications of the ether. He says that question is the final goal of modern science.

**Meteorological Observations on the Eiffel Tower.**—The "uselessness" of the Eiffel Tower has been much commented on by the practical utilitarian. To him its only office seemed to be that of giving the pleasure-seeking crowd the sensation of "altitude." Meteorologists have far different ideas of the famous structure. They have eagerly availed themselves of the opportunity of having a height upon which they may experiment to their hearts' content in such an accessible site as the French capital. The meteorological

work of three months alone redeems the Tower from the stigma of uselessness, and forcibly suggests the idea that the uses for meteorological observation would have alone justified the Parisians in raising this monument to engineering skill.

In a note recently published in the "Journal" of the French Academy of Sciences, M. Angot gave the results of experiments made to ascertain the velocity of the wind on the summit of the Eiffel Tower, compared with its velocity at the low elevation of the central meteorological station. An identical instrument—an "anémomètre-cinématographe" was used at both points of observation. On the Eiffel Tower the vanes were at an altitude of 303 metres from the ground, and on the turret of the central meteorological station they were 21 metres from the ground, and at a horizontal distance of 500 metres from the Tower. M. Angot, up to the 1st of October made observations on the Tower extending over 101 days, 12 of these were in June, 28 in July, 31 in August, and 30 in September. The general mean of velocity for 101 days was found to be 7 metres .05 on the Tower, and 2 metres .24 at the meteorological station. The velocity is therefore three times greater at the top of the Tower than near the ground. M. Angot reminds us of the fact that in meteorological stations of low level, the velocity of the wind increases with the day and falls with the night, in an analogous manner to the variations of temperature. On mountainous stations the contrary is the rule. M. Angot thinks it is a remarkable fact that this inversion is found to exist at a height so relatively small as the Eiffel Tower. He says it might be asked whether this peculiarity is not due in part to air disturbances caused by the mass of the Tower getting heated by the sun's rays in the day-time. First of all M. Angot explains that this is not probable because of the shape of Tower, the relative lightness of the structure, and the small amount of surface which it offers to the wind. Then he tells us that he has pretty well proved that there is no foundation for such an argument, for he has calculated separately the means of two series of observations, one extending over 20 days during which there was always a clear sky, with a wind from north to east; the other extending over 33 days, during which there was a clouded sky, with a wind from south to west. He has not found differences between the two series that would justify the explanation, and concludes that the velocity of the wind at the height of the Eiffel Tower is very different from its velocity at the surface of the earth, approaching to the conditions that are observed on high mountains.

There is another important point to be noted from these observations—that is, that the velocity of the wind at a height of 300 metres is very much greater than has been generally supposed. For 100 days in the summer the mean exceeds 7 metres per second. During 2516 hours of observation included in this period the velocity of the wind has been in 986 hours more than 8 metres per second, and during 823 hours more than 10 metres per second.

M. Angot suggests that the knowledge of these figures is of great interest for the study of the problem of aerial Navigation.

**The late Dr. Joule.**—On October 10 last, at his residence near Manchester, died Dr. James Prescott Joule, age 71, the great physicist and the discoverer of the mechanical equivalent of heat, known as "Joule's Equivalent." The son of a brewer at Salford, he was, on account of his delicacy, brought up at home by tutors. At the age of 15 he commenced studying chemistry under the great Dalton, in the rooms of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society. There, in time, he read many of his papers, and in Manchester took place most of his experiments, so that the late influential meeting in that city to consider a memorial to their great citizen, verified Sir Henry Roscoe's saying of 32 years ago, that in the future Manchester would be famous not as the seat of the cotton trade but as "the place where John Dalton worked out the atomic theory of chemistry, and James Prescott Joule placed upon a sure experimental basis the grand principle of the conservation of energy." Leading a life of beautiful simplicity, shunning publicity, he sought not for fame, but only for truth. Yet honours were heaped on him. He was Honorary D.C.L. of Oxford, Honorary LL.D. of Edinburgh and Dublin, Honorary Fellow of many learned Societies, English and Foreign. A Fellow of the Royal Society, he was the recipient of its Gold Royal Medal in 1852, and of its Copley Gold Medal in 1870; he likewise received the Society of Arts' Albert Medal in 1880, and in 1878 a pension from the Queen of £200 a year.

When only twenty years of age, after much original work, in one of a series of papers on "Electro-Magnetic Forces" published in "Sturgeon's Annals of Electricity," he pointed out a defect in experimental comparisons "arising from incomplete descriptions of apparatus, and from the arbitrary and vague numbers which are used to characterize electric currents." "Such a practice," he says, "might be tolerated in the infancy of the science, but in its present state of advancement greater precision and propriety are imperatively demanded." And in this remark we see the experimenter unequalled for skill and minute accuracy, in whose hands that which was too difficult to permit others to draw any trustworthy conclusions, yielded to him often an important law of generalization. We recognize the penetration that a few years later deduced from experiment the equivalence of heat and work, and formulated the now well-known mechanical equivalent of heat. This is one of those laws which, by the universality of their application, help to simplify our conceptions of nature and to bring the various physical sciences into the harmony of a common mechanical philosophy. Its establishment did for energy that which Lavoisier had done for matter—it proved that energy could neither be created nor destroyed, that its sum in the universe is invariable, but that its manifestations can be interchanged, though always in definite and quantitative relations.

It is hard now to realize that the law of the conservation of energy—the groundwork of all the branches of physical science—was unknown in 1841 ; that then the properties of friction were as unexplained as is the property of gravitation. Men believed that friction destroyed energy, and that in the action of the steam engine it was created ; heat was imponderable, so was electricity, while those who thought heat must be mechanical action had no measure of mechanical action “in which to gauge the equivalent.” It is true that the various branches of physical science, studied separately, had advanced in the right direction, some notably under Dalton, Faraday, Fourier, Dulong, and Sturgeon. But it was reserved to Joule to suggest the equivalencies in each case, and to experimentally fix their numerical values. “ Before he came to the equivalence of the work spent in overcoming fluid or solid friction, and the heat produced ; and, again, between the work spent in compressing air and the heat produced,” engine-makers had arrived at considering work against resistance as “the mechanical and commercial measure of potency.” Rumford had first seen the nature of the relation between heat and mechanical action ; Mayer had even attained in thought the mechanical equivalent of heat ; but Joule first established it on a sound experimental basis ; and from the importance and generality of the ensuing results, the discoverer of the most general recognized law in the universe stands with Newton and Dalton in the history of physical science. All the papers containing Joule’s experiments and deductions can be found in two volumes of his collected papers, edited by himself, published by the Physical Society of London. Their style is as remarkable as is their matter—models of clearness and of patient accuracy, without a mathematical symbol, yet with the experiments so stated that a mathematician could easily reduce them to mathematical representation.

**Rabies.**—The Society of Arts, with its accustomed eagerness to discuss the vital scientific questions of the day, ensured that the topic of “ rabies ” should occupy one of the earliest meetings of the present session. Dr. Ruffer was eminently fitted to be the exponent of the subject, as he has had such a long and intimate acquaintance with the Pasteur Institute. After his clear exposition of the nature of the terrible disease, his contradiction of the popular delusions regarding it, his statistical evidence as to the value of inoculation, and his enumeration of the exceedingly simple means by which rabies can be utterly eradicated from this island, no one need be ignorant on the subject, even if some continue to indulge in that “sentiment” which is a powerful cause of the continuance of rabies.

Dr. Ruffer points out that rabies has a characteristic differing from all other infectious diseases. Its virus thrives only in a living body. Happily for the human race, sunlight and dryness are its natural disinfectants. In a dead animal the virus does not long survive its victim. Fear of infection is therefore limited to the

injection of the virus from one living body to another, and, as is well known, the ordinary way this injection occurs is through the bite of a rabid dog, the only propagator to be feared in this country. But it is not only by biting that the poison can be injected. A person whose chapped hand was merely licked by a dog suffering from the first symptoms of rabies has died in consequence. This is a very important point to be noted, for the only popular notion of a mad dog was an animal rushing wildly about and biting every one who comes in its path. It is true these symptoms happen frequently in the last stage of the disease; but we are told by Dr. Ruffer that at an early stage there is often a symptom of increased affection on the part of the dog, demonstrated by licking the hands and face; therefore any unusual excess of affection may be received with caution. There is another variety of rabies called "dumb rabies," characterized by the symptoms of paralysis. This, Dr. Ruffer says, is not less common, while it is just as dangerous, because many are not on their guard against it.

It has been often supposed that rabies is aggravated by heat. Experience shows there is no reason to suppose that the virus flourishes more in summer than in winter. It occurs amongst the dogs in the Arctic regions as well as amongst those in India and Africa. The statistics as to the cases treated at the Pasteur Institute show that during the years 1887 and 1888, 56 per cent. of all cases occur from December 1 to June 1, and 44 per cent. from June 1 to December 1. The highest number of patients in both years came to the Institute in February, and the lowest in November. Comparatively few patients were bitten in June, July, and August. Dr. Ruffer points out that the conventional word "hydrophobia" is a misnomer, it means fear of water. The rabid dog or human being have known no peculiar fear of water, though naturally they shrink from water, because the imbibing of fluids usually gives painful spasms in the throat.

There is only one remedy for a human being when bitten by a rabid animal that is a preventive one—being inoculated with the virus before the development of the disease. Dr. Ruffer calls attention to the fact that misstatements have appeared in print as to the source of the virus used for inoculation. It is always rabbits that are used for its production, and not dogs, as has sometimes been stated. The statistics quoted by Dr. Ruffer prove the value of M. Pasteur's work most conclusively. To appreciate it one must realize the usual rate of mortality from rabies when the patient is left without inoculation. Dr. Ruffer produced abundant statistics to show the usual rate of mortality of those bitten by rabid animals. From these statistics he states a general average of 15 per cent. for those bitten by dogs. This average he thinks may be rather too low. The average for those bitten by wolves he concludes is 60 per cent. Now the statistics concerning the Pasteur Institute show that during the year 1887 the number of persons inoculated were 1778. The average mortality was as low as 1·34 per cent. During the

next year it was even less, being 1·16 per cent. In order to obtain confirmatory evidence to these results, Dr. Ruffer has collected valuable data concerning the working of other anti-rabies institutions that follow the Pasteur treatment, and the statistics of mortality give figures approximating to those of the Pasteur Institute. To take two examples out of the many given. Dr. Bardach, the present Director of the "Institut Antirabique" of Odessa, inoculated 333 persons, of which only 2 have died (mortality 0·63 per cent.) Amongst the successful cases was one with thirty deep wounds, the results of bites from a rabid wolf. From the 1st of December to the 1st of August, 1889, 244 persons bitten by rabid animals were inoculated at Bucharest. The mortality amongst these is absolutely *nil*. But while Dr. Ruffer recommends all persons that are bitten by a rabid animal to take the first train to Paris and put themselves in M. Pasteur's hands, he is evidently of the same opinion as M. Pasteur himself, that in this country there is no necessity to have an anti-rabies institute. M. Pasteur's words on the subject were : "In England you are most favourably situated for getting rid of the disease, in consequence of your insular position ; you may make my method absolutely superfluous. Germany had to muzzle in perpetuity, being surrounded by nations who did not muzzle ; but in England it would only be necessary to have a certain period—not very long—of universal muzzling, and then a rigid quarantine afterwards."

How simple is then the remedy at home; but it has met with obstinate opposition from a section of the public who have chosen to weigh the alleviation of such intense human suffering with the fancied temporary inconvenience of a pampered pet. As Dr. Fleming said during the discussion that followed the reading of Dr. Ruffer's paper, the objection to the muzzle is frivolous in the extreme. Why should dogs be exempted from a slight restriction of that kind, when horses have to bear shoeing and submit to a bit and bearing rein ? In 1886 the Dog Owners Protection Society published erroneous statements, going so far as to say that there was no such thing as rabies ; but surely credit will not be any longer given to such statements now that publicity is being given to the true aspects of the case. It seems hopeful that Parliament during the coming session will adopt the expedient and right course, and pass a Bill to ensure general muzzling and effectual quarantine.

---

## Notes of Travel and Exploration.

---

**Russia in Central Asia in 1889.**—Mr. Curzon has written a book\* which is at once a personal narrative of travel along the newly-constructed Transcaspian railway in the months of September and October 1888, and a sound and well-reasoned survey of the Central Asian Question in its social, political, and commercial aspects. As to the railway itself his view is that its effect in increasing the moral preponderance of Russia in Central Asia has been much underrated in this country, and that it has not only strengthened her hold on the regions admittedly within the sphere of her dominion, but has brought Persia and Khorasan practically within her clutch. Its commercial results are hardly less important, for it gives Russia a monopoly of the markets of Bokhara, which formerly did a large trade with England, and will also secure for her those of Northern Persia and Khorasan. The development of the cotton-growing industry of Turkestan will enable her to supply herself thence with cotton which can be sold in Moscow for fourpence a pound, whereas that imported from abroad has hitherto averaged sevenpence. Russian cotton goods are now purchased at the fair of Nijni Novgorod by traders from Khiva, Bokhara, Tashkend, and even Asia Minor, who formerly supplied themselves with English goods *via* the Levant or the port of Batoum. In Afghanistan also English merchandise is being supplanted by Russian, while the transit trade through that country, *via* Herat and Kerk-i to Bokhara, amounting in 1881 to 3600 camel loads, and 1025 tons weight, had declined in 1884 to 1700 camel loads, or 490 tons weight, and has now become non-existent, communication by caravan between Kabul and Bokhara having ceased in the autumn of 1888.

**Population and Resources of Turkestan.**—The population of the Russian provinces in Central Asia is very sparse, being only 1·8 inhabitants to every square verst as compared with 19·3 in European Russia, 17·9 in Caucasia, and 71·4 in Poland. Turkestan with an area of 611,000 square versts had, in 1885, 2,335,000 inhabitants, of whom 1,430,000 were sedentary and 905,000 nomads. Of 152,500,000 acres in Turkestan 70,000,000, or nearly one-half are steppe, mountain, or sand waste, entirely useless for cultivation, 75,000,000 are available only for pasture, 5,000,000 are under cultivation, and 2,500,000 are prairie lands. Wheat, rice, sorghum, millet, and barley are the principal cereals grown, and of textile products, cotton occupies the first place, flax and hemp coming second and third. The nomads of the Syr Daria and Amu Daria

---

\* "Russia in Central Asia in 1889." By George N. Curzon, M.P. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1889.

districts raise annually three million pouds of cotton (the poud is 36 lbs.), while Zerafshan, Kuraminsk, and Khojend produce 400,000, and Ferghana 150,000 pouds. Sericulture is one of the principal industries; Central Asia furnishing a total of 103,000 pouds of spun silk, which, at the price of 125 roubles the poud, gives an annual revenue of nearly 13,000,000 roubles (£1,300,000). Horticulture is extensively practised, melons and potatoes being grown on a large scale, and fruit culture occupies an area of 250,000 acres, the dried fruits of Turkestan being exported to all parts of Siberia and Southern Russia. The total export trade of Turkestan to the Fairs of the Steppes and Russia is estimated at £1,080,000, and its imports at £1,200,000. Tashkend, the capital, with its houses standing in gardens, covers an area of 2,500,000 acres, equal to that of Paris, with a population of 120,000, of whom 100,000 are crowded into the native or Sart quarter. The Russian civil and military populations amount each to 10,000, and the native and European cities are totally distinct from each other.

**Address on Morocco.**—Sir John Hay, who as British Representative in Morocco for forty-two years, has had exceptional opportunities of familiarizing himself with that country, delivered an address on its present condition, before a meeting of the London Chamber of Commerce, on November 13th. Beginning with the observation that the customs, habits, thoughts, and even the garments of the Moors, especially of the population of the interior, remote from contact with Europeans at the sea-ports, are still such as those we read of in the Old and New Testaments, he passed on to the more practical subject of trade, of which Great Britain commands three-fourths. France comes next, and Germany is beginning to make her way in the competition. The chief imports are sugars. Morocco, though possessing a fine climate and fertile soil, is kept in a deplorably stagnant condition owing to misgovernment, dating from the expulsion of the Moors from Spain. The officials, none of whom, save those connected with the Customs, receive any salary or payment, depend, from the Vizir and chief officers of the Sultan's Court to the lowest gendarme, on bribery, extortion, and peculation of every kind. There is no security for property, and maladministration produces perpetual insurrections in the provinces, to repress which the Sultan encamps with an army of 10,000 or 20,000 strong in the rebellious district, men and horses feeding on the crops, cattle, and sheep, and the rabble of troopers pillaging the villages and committing crimes of every description. An attempt was made in 1884 by three Great Powers (Great Britain, France, and Germany) to induce the Sultan's Government to agree to a revision of the Convention of Commerce of 1856, under which very high export duties were imposed, but the negotiations broke down after months of useless discussion, the three Moorish Commissioners being unauthorized to make any substantial concession. The lecturer went on to recommend active intervention on the part of the European Powers, all pledged to abstain from

conquest or annexation, and guaranteeing the integrity of the Sultan's dominions, on condition of his adopting improved methods of government, and introducing roads, railways, and telegraphs as facilities for commerce and intercommunication. The present system of protection extended to native agents by European merchants would be abolished or would cease of itself, and the foreign representatives should be required to reside at the capital, instead of, as at present, at Tangiers.

**Winter Travelling in Siberia.**—Mr. Gowing\* tells the story of an adventurous overland journey through Siberia, undertaken as a mode of returning to England from Shanghai in preference to the ordinary one by ocean steamer. He and his friend started in mid-winter from Vladivostock, the Russian port on the Pacific, and thence to Nijni Novgorod, where the railway was struck for the first time, accomplished 5407 miles by sledge, and 84 by tarantass (a wheeled vehicle); employing the services of 1100 horses, changed at 357 post stations, and spending in almost continuous travelling twelve weeks, during which fifty nights were passed in the open air, protected only by the open hood of the sledge, with a temperature frequently as low as 80° of frost, and the mercury sometimes frozen in the thermometer. The recumbent position of the travellers, lying on mattresses in their vehicle, enabled them to protect themselves more perfectly than in a seated posture, and the actual suffering from cold was not great. The constant freezing of the breath reducing head and throat mufflers, as well as beard and moustache, to a congealed mass, requiring frequent thawing, is one of the principal inconveniences complained of. The travelling was continuous by day and night, save for occasional delays in getting fresh horses.

**From Pekin to St. Petersburg.**—A similar journey was described to the members of the Manchester Geographical Society (*Journal*, January-March, 1889), by Mr. Molesworth, C.E., who, however, instead of keeping entirely to Russian territory with Vladivostock as his point of departure, started from Pekin, and traversed Northern China and Mongolia, entering Siberia at the frontier town of Kiachta. Up to this point the journey, began on September 22nd, 1888, was made on mules as far as the Great Wall, and thence on camels, with tents to sleep in, biscuits, porridge, and tinned provisions were taken by the caravan, but where there were inhabitants brick tea was generally bartered for a sheep or goat. The food of the natives is described as a sort of porridge, made of a handful of yellow millet boiled in water, to which is added a piece of brick tea, lumps of mutton fat and bones. This *pot au feu* was not found very appetizing by the travellers. Kiachta was reached on October 21st, and here for the first time the travellers slept under a roof, though not in a bed, rugs on the floor being the substitute. This

---

\* "Five Thousand Miles on a Sledge." By Lionel F. Gowing. London: Chatto and Windus. 1889.

town, once very flourishing, has lost much of its trade since the opening of the Treaty Ports deprived it of its monopoly of traffic with China. The splendour of its cathedral attests its former prosperity, as it is fitted with silver altars, and a rood screen of gold, silver, and precious stones, valued at £10,000. The tarantass with post-horses was the vehicle used hence to Krasnoiarsk on the Yenesei, after which, from November 13th, it was exchanged for a sledge, retained as far as Nijni Novgorod, where the railway was met on December 15. London was reached on December 29, in 108 days after leaving Shanghai, of which eighty-four were spent in actual travelling. The summary of the total journey of 8169 miles (Shanghai to Manchester), gives 4509 miles as the distance traversed by cart, camel, tarantass, and sledge, 800 that done by steamer, and 2860 by rail.

**British Zambesia.**—A new mercantile company has been chartered for the development of the great South African region lying between the existing colonies and the River Zambesi. The area embraced is 400,000 square miles, a third larger than that of the German Empire, and comprises districts ranging through every degree of productiveness, from the sterility of the Kalahari Desert to the rich metalliferous country of the Matabele Zulus. This latter region is said to offer great agricultural possibilities, and its native ruler Lobengula, fierce savage as he is, has yet sufficient shrewdness to appreciate the necessity of being on good terms with advancing civilization. His people are a robber tribe of Zulus, who, under his father, took possession of their present territory, driving out or exterminating its previous inhabitants, whose survivors living on their borders they continue to harass by their exterminating raids. As Matabeleland is a hill and plateau country, 5000 to 6000 feet above the sea, it is free from malarious diseases, and offers a promising future field for European colonization. A railway from the Cape Colony to the Zambesi, *via* Bechuanaland, entirely through British protected territory, is one of the designs of the company, thus opening up regions hitherto blocked by the obstructiveness of the Transvaal Boers. The new enterprize is all the more hopeful, as it is primarily a creation of colonial initiative, Mr. Rhodes, the Diamond King of Kimberley, being its moving spirit. The Duke of Fife, the Duke of Abercorn, and Mr. Albert Sassoona form a permanent directorate, sufficiently responsible to guarantee the solidity of the scheme. This is the fourth great territorial company chartered within the last few years, the others being the British North Borneo Company, the Royal Niger Company, and the British East African Company.

**Proposed Waterway between Birmingham and the Humber.**—A project of immense importance to the Midlands is, according to the *Staffordshire Advertiser*, being resolutely pushed on by a few enterprising commercial men, and will in all probability be introduced into Parliament in the shape of a Bill during the next Session. Under the name of the Trent Valley Navigation Scheme it has for its object the construction of a short canal connecting Birmingham

with the Trent, and thus securing for steam-propelled barges ready access to the German Ocean. The canal is to have a width of eighty feet, and the river is to be dredged and widened to the point where the Lower Trent navigation commences. From Wilden Ferry there is a stretch of the Trent, twenty miles in length, over which the Marquis of Anglesea has "the navigation rights with toll-free access to the German Ocean," and these rights have, it is stated, been virtually acquired by the promoters of the enterprise. The navigation of the Lower Trent right to the Humber, and the absence of toll-dues (goods being transferred from the barges to the ships' holds in the open Humber mouth) present advantages of so great and substantial a character that they cannot well be exaggerated. It appears that no serious engineering difficulties threaten the project. Between Water Orton and Posthill the river will have to be deepened and widened, curves cut across, stone bridges replaced by girder ones of larger span, and in some places concrete embankments constructed as a precaution against floods. The Warwick Canal Company, which has a network of waterways near Birmingham, promises co-operation, and the scheme will give the latter town a waterway seven to nine feet deep and eighty feet wide to the North Sea, with barge-trains computed to carry 400 tons per steam tug. It is estimated that merchandize may be thus transported to the estuary—170 miles—at an average cost of 8s. per ton, an immense reduction on railway transit, as may be gathered from the fact that Burton-on-Trent alone calculates on thus saving £100,000 a year.

**Congress on the Great Lakes.**—A Congress has recently been held at West Superior, Wisconsin, with a view to considering the improvement of navigation on the Great Lakes. More than a hundred delegates took part in it, and the importance of their task was emphasized by the statement that the yearly amount of the lacustrine traffic is estimated at two hundred millions sterling, and that the trade route of a region of a million square miles, and of a population of seventeen millions, is in question. An appeal has been made to the Government, which indirectly subsidizes the railways, and improves the navigation of the Mississippi, to do something for the lakes as well. Nothing less is aimed at than their adaptation for Ocean traffic, and a series of resolutions was passed calling for the construction of a canal twenty feet deep to unite them, for the deepening of their ports to enable them to accommodate vessels of that draught of water, and for the construction of a maritime canal from the head of Lake Superior to the Atlantic. The railway interest will naturally oppose these changes, as their object is to lower rates of transport to those of lake and river carriage. It is pointed out that the cost of freight on the enormous actual volume of commerce on the Lakes does not exceed ten million of dollars a year, the average rate being 0·23 cents. per thousand tons instead of that of one cent. per thousand, the average charge on the great railways during 1886. The effect on commerce would be to extend an arm of the Atlantic into the heart of the

American continent, and place the whole extent of the Lake shores in the position of a maritime seaboard. An enormous influx of wealth and activity would follow, as the great grain and cattle producing regions of the West would be placed in direct communication with the markets of Europe.

**Italy in Africa.**—The assumption by Italy of a protectorate over Abyssinia promises to open up to European influence a sphere long closed to it. Her acquisitions in this quarter began in 1870 with the establishment of a coaling station by the Rubattino Company on the Bay of Assab, about seventy miles north of the French station at Obock, and half that distance from the Straits of Babel-Mandeb. Here a territory estimated at 550 square miles, mostly rock and sand dunes, but with a good anchorage, was annexed in 1882. The occupation of Massowah in 1885 was the prelude to that of the whole intervening coast, with some small places commanding the trade routes to the interior. The resentment of Abyssinia led to a desultory campaign, of which the most striking incident was the battle of Dogali on January 25, 1887, when the Italian force was slaughtered almost to a man. The defeat and death of King John at the hands of the Dervishes on March 10, 1889, resulted in the assumption of the title of Negus by King Menelek of Shoa, the ally of the Italians, and in the cession by him to them of the considerable territories of Keren and Asmara. The embassy, subsequently despatched by him to Rome, negotiated a loan of four million francs guaranteed by Italy, and accepted the virtual protectorate of that country over Menelek's dominions.

Meantime a treaty, signed on February 8, 1889, with the Sultan of Oppia, on the Somali Coast, made over to Italy a stretch of some 450 miles of that littoral, with territories, the estimate of whose area varies between 12,000 and 45,000 square miles. The whole of the regions now reckoned within the sphere of Italian influence, under one title or another, sums up to 300,000 square miles, of which greater part is comparatively valueless. Parts of the Abyssinian territories are, indeed, very productive, but their riches are for the present rendered inaccessible by the extremely mountainous nature of the country.

**Commercial Prospects of Massowah.**—The Official Report of Captain Cecchi to the Italian Government, states: 1st. That though the territory annexed may prove adapted to agricultural colonization, the promise of the soil in Africa is deceptive, and would not, in any case, suffice to give life to Massowah without trade.

2nd. That the hopes of the future must rest principally on trade, but no account can be made of the province of Tigré, which is poor, has not resources enough for itself, and would require many years and great reforms before producing sufficient for its own consumption.

3rd. That as to the rest of Abyssinia, which is less poor and famine-stricken than Tigré, it can have no trade with Massowah, because its communications are by the shorter route through Somali

Land, and would at the most reach Assab. The commerce of Abyssinia is thus excluded from Massowah.

4th. That there remains the trade of the Soudan, which Captain Cecchi divides into two branches. The first, which follows the Nile, with Khartoum as its base, can never find an outlet by way of Massowah. The second, that of the Eastern Soudan, might, indeed, take this direction, but in order to induce it to do so, roads must be constructed, rendering the transit Kassala-Massowah shorter than the Kassala-Suakin route, and the Soudanese tribes must be persuaded to abandon the latter for the former.

The Italian Government gives great facilities to the Deputies for a visit to its African possessions, granting them a gratuitous passage thither on board its ships: but their accounts of what they have seen, even under these favourable circumstances, are not always encouraging. Signor Plebano, recently returned from the journey, says that no great commercial development is to be expected there, and that though some regions might be susceptible of improved cultivation, a large outlay of capital would be required.

**Geographical Results of Stanley's Expedition.**—Mr. Stanley's journey, while it has been successful in achieving its main object, has also added many details to our geographical knowledge of Equatorial Africa. He has definitively restricted the area of Lake Albert to a much smaller limit than that assigned by previous travellers, and has roughly ascertained the outline of the sheet of water to the south of it, to which he has given the name of Lake Albert Edward. He has, moreover, given this latter lake an important function in the Nile system, through the large volume of water it pours into Lake Albert by the channel of the Semliki river, which may prove its most southerly feeder. This river, the main drain of the left or western Nile Basin, as the Victoria Nile is of the right or eastern Nile Basin, meets the latter affluent in the common reservoir of Lake Albert, whence the united waters of both issue in the single stream of the White Nile. A great mass of snow mountain, nearly 20,000 feet high, called by the natives Ruwenzori, flanks the valley of the Semliki on the west, occupying nearly the same place as that assigned on the map to Mount Gordon Bennett, with which it is probably identical. It was ascended to a height of over 10,000 feet by one of the officers of the expedition, who found himself there cut off from the true summit by intervening chasms.

While Mr. Stanley has circumscribed the area of Lake Albert, he has largely extended that of its companion, Lake Victoria, having discovered a south-westerly arm of the latter, screened from previous observation by a fringe of overlapping islands, which adds about 6000 square miles to its expanse. The region between the Lakes and the Aruwimi, thrice traversed by the expedition, is mainly covered with forest, and presented great difficulties on the march. Part of the population of this region consists of that diminutive race whose existence, known to the ancients, was long

supposed to be fabulous. They are evidently the same as the Akkas, specimens of whom were procured by Mr. Scheinfarth, and seem to be of the same stock as the Bushmen of the South.

**The People of East Greenland.**\*—The people of East Greenland are supposed to have come originally from Norway, and been shipwrecked on this coast. Their food is raw meat, oil, and blood, none of which are ever cooked. They often lose their sight altogether, or suffer in their eyes in various ways from the snow. When the sun disappears they have starlight, and even at night have light enough to go about. They live and carpet their huts with furs, and roll themselves in them to sleep. The fur is sewn up in a sack, into which the occupant crawls head first, coming out backwards when he wakes. The only distinction in social position is conferred by the possession of a flint, which makes the difference between poverty and wealth. These flints, got from the ocean when the ice breaks up, are, with walrus tusks, their only means of making fire, and those who have none are compelled to borrow from their better-provided neighbours. A man who wants a wife must steal her, and his courtship begins by going to the young lady's house on pretence of borrowing from her parents. If his visits are frequent, they take the alarm, and keep strict watch over her, not because they object to him as a suitor, but because they wish him to prove his fitness by stealing the girl away without their knowledge. If he succeed in getting her outside the hut undiscovered, he has made good his title, and she becomes his wife; but if he is caught in the attempt, he is killed, while the girl looks on and laughs, acquiescing in his fate, as she despises him for his failure. No Greenlander ever tells a lie, and the children are said never to repeat an offence, because cruelly punished the first time by being burned with a bone heated in the fire until the fat boils out of it. They do not run about and play like civilized children, but are obliged to sit still with their arms crossed tightly in front. This treatment, it is stated, shortens the arms, particularly of the girls.

**An Adventure in Turkey.**—A letter from Constantinople to the Vienna Correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* narrates the following incident :

One afternoon, about a fortnight ago, M. Le Réé, French Consul-General at Scutari, went for a walk in the neighbourhood of that town, with his little girls, aged respectively four and one-and-a-half, their governess, and a kavass. On their way home, as they passed a guard-house situated near the entrance of the town, they found several soldiers standing about in the only practicable path. They did not get out of the way for M. Le Réé and his party, and obliged the governess, who was walking in front, to wade through the mud. M. Le Réé pushed one of the soldiers aside as he walked on; but when he had passed the man stepped back, and defiantly prevented the kavass from following his master. M. Le Réé came to his assistance, whereupon the soldiers turned out of the guard-house and sided with their comrade. A

---

\* *Journal Manchester Geographical Society, January–March, 1889.*

lieutenant of police, who arrived at this juncture, called out to the soldiers, "Thrash the Giaours!" and made a rush at the person of the Consul-General. A blow on the head from a stout walking-stick sent him howling to the rear. The kavass, who had been prevented by M. Le Réé from making use of his sword was then arrested, disarmed, beaten, and taken under escort to the Konak, whither M. Le Réé likewise repaired, after he had taken his children home. He was accompanied by a second kavass, with whom he went to the guard-room to see the prisoner. An altercation took place with the "zaptiehs" on duty, in the course of which the second kavass was also knocked down, beaten, and disarmed. The Governor-General, attracted by the noise, came downstairs, and begged M. Le Réé to go with him to the reception-room. There a conversation took place, the Governor-General expressing regret at what had happened, and eventually giving orders for the release of the kavasses. Whether the incident will be followed up by the French Government remains to be seen.

**A Mountain of Gold.**—The great Mount Morgan gold mine in Central Queensland is thus designated, not without appropriateness, as it is paying over a million a year in dividends. The history of the mine, which has only been developed during the last year, is, says a correspondent in the *Times* of November 30th, a curious one. The original selector of the freehold, which contained so much hidden wealth in a farm of 640 acres, was a man named Donald Gordon, who paid five shillings an acre for it and used it for grazing cattle. A correspondent of the *Sydney Morning Herald* who visited the mine some time ago tells his readers how, on his return, he stopped at a wayside inn, where a tall, grizzled, weather-beaten man took his horse to a well to drink.

This was the original holder of the freehold, who parted with it to the Morgans. He said he had always believed the mountain to be of ironstone, and never knew of the fortune that was so long within his grasp. In olden days he used to sell the pumice-stone looking quartz in Rockhampton to clean the hearths and doorsteps of the houses.

He, in selling the freehold to the Messrs. Morgan for £640, thought, no doubt, he had made a very good bargain, but the discovery of gold in 1882 raised the value of the property to a very different scale. The Messrs. Morgan at first retained half in their own hands, disposing of the rest to four other gentlemen, to whom they eventually sold the remainder of their interest for £93,000. The present company was formed in 1886, with a capital of £1,000,000 in £1 shares, on which 17s. 6d. was paid up.

A mining township of tents, bark-huts, and corrugated-iron cottages has already sprung up at the foot of the hill, and numbers 5000 inhabitants. The mine is contained in a conical hill about 500 feet high, externally undistinguishable from the neighbouring acclivities, save by two sets of works, one at the base and another halfway up.

**Extraction of the Gold.**—Some 200 feet from the top (says the correspondent) a tunnel runs in for about 700 feet, when it is met by a shaft down which the stone is sent. It is then brought through the tunnel in small trucks, and shot down a slide to the upper works, while a cable-tramway supplies the lower

works. At the top of the mountain is a regular quarry, where some five dozen men are occupied in blasting and quarrying the stone. Fifty-two feet have been already cut away, and they are now working at a second bench. The preponderating stone is a kind of black ironstone, with no appearance of gold whatever; yet it yields as much as five and six ounces to the ton. Some of the stone is reddish, and looks as if it might contain copper, while here and there is a bank of yellowish sand which yields eleven ounces to the ton. Formerly, the ore was treated by the ordinary battery and quicksilver amalgamation process, but the gold is so finely distributed through the stone that most of it was lost, and the tailings are being treated with very good results by the chlorination process now in use at the mine. Under this process the ore is first crushed by powerful machinery, and reduced to fine sand. It is then roasted in furnaces, and when cooled is placed in the chlorination barrels and subjected to the action of chlorine gas, which dissolves the gold, and it flows out in a fluid the colour of sherry into large vats. It is then placed in charcoal filters, and the gold adheres to the charcoal beds which are subsequently roasted in a reverberatory furnace until nothing is left but an ash containing 75 per cent. of metallic gold. The works, which are lit throughout by the electric light, are kept constantly going night and day. Nine hundred men are employed, and work in three shifts of eight hours each. The expenditure of wages is about £100,000 per annum; 4000 tons of firewood are burnt per month, and the output of gold is about a ton per month. If the works were stopped for a single day it would mean a loss to the shareholders of £4000.

*Quality of the Ore.*—While some ascribe a volcanic origin to this remarkable deposit, others, among them the Government Geologist of Queensland, think that only a thermal spring could have produced the formation. The richness of the ore is extraordinary, for one sample assayed as much as 1300 ozs., and another over 400 ozs., to the ton—a steady average of not less than 5 ozs. being maintained. The purity of the metal is equally remarkable, for while no gold in nature has been hitherto found unalloyed with silver, in the Mount Morgan gold it exists only as the merest trace. It assays 99·7 or 99·8 of gold, the remainder being copper with a trace of iron. This quality is worth £4 4s. 8d. per oz. It is said to be the richest native gold hitherto found.

*Dividends of the Company.*—The present Company, formed in August, 1886, paid in 1887 1s., and in the following year 1s. 6d. per £1 share. During the first six months of 1889, £575,000 was paid in dividends, and it was estimated in the half-yearly report, published in June, that the total dividends for the year would amount to £1,200,000—"more than any mine in Australia has ever paid in the whole course of its existence."

Speculation in the shares has, however, sometimes been disastrous, as they ran up in the course of 1889 to £16 and £17, and many buying at that price had to sell during a subsequent decline to £10. The original shareholders have become millionaires, and the only question as to future profits is, how long the present deposits will hold out.

---

## Notes on Novels.

---

*The Pariah.* By F. ANSTEY. Three Vols. London : Smith, Elder & Co. 1889.

"THE Pariah" is interesting, which is a novel's first and last virtue. But the deficient and underbred young man who furnishes the tragedy of the book is sometimes too stupid and sometimes too brilliant. The difficulty of getting a tragedy out of real life in modern days is that commonsense views and straightforward explanations are fatal to tragedy ; and if we are introduced to commonplace people, we know and feel that such views and explanations would be ready when wanted. Margot, the superfine young lady whom the wretched Allen worships, sends him to misery and death by a misunderstanding which nine girls out of ten would have found out. As for herself, the reader conceives such a violent disgust from the first for her heartless shallowness, that he is really cheated and injured when she turns out, not only to be better than one thought, but to be in fact almost heroic. One feels she could not have been brave enough to carry her sister's secret so resolutely. The lover whom she affects—and as to him the reader indulges in legitimate satisfaction—is a dark-faced, terribly-in-earnest young man (handsome of course, and a barrister of wondrous prowess), who finds out that she is telling a lie, and casts her off ; and then finds out she has not told a lie, and grovels once more at her feet. One is sorry the resolute young man did not marry her, as he would have been sure to "lead her a life." But she escapes with a middle-aged gentleman who has something to do with Burmah. The little girl, Lettie, is a pleasant picture of a precocious, fearless, and well-brought-up English child. There is an easy-going humorous Rector, whom we should have been pleased to have more of. Allen's father and his detestable step-mother are solidly drawn, but with rather too heavy a touch. Mr. Anstey should have put more humour into the book. If it had been really humorous, it would have been first-rate. As it is, it is respectable, and may be strongly recommended as a novel to read and enjoy.

---

*Marooned.* By W. CLARK RUSSELL. London : Macmillan. 1889.

M R. CLARK RUSSELL'S fertile inventiveness seems inexhaustible in giving variety to his special subject, the possible incidents and accidents of a seafaring life. The present work is in no degree inferior to any of its predecessors in interest, and is in some respects an advance on them. The title implies the central situation

of the tale, since the hero and heroine are landed by a mutinous crew to shift for themselves on an uninhabited island, one of the numerous minor members of the Bahama group. The pair thus isolated from the rest of humanity are not, in the first instance, lovers, the young lady, Miss Aurelia Grant, having been entrusted to the care of her companion during the voyage to Rio Janeiro, by her promised husband, who awaits her there. As she is possessed of the astonishing beauty conferred on heroines by right, the loyalty of her escort to his friend is severely tried, even before the enforced *tête-à-tête* on the island makes the task of concealing his feelings from their object a still more difficult one. Their intercourse under these circumstances is well portrayed, and the incidents of their prolonged pic-nic are lively enough to prevent the recital from becoming monotonous. When the scene changes to the deck of a small schooner entirely manned by West Indian coloured people, we have a new phase of nautical character put before us with the author's inimitable felicity in sketching such types. Among the rude and half-savage seamen with whom she is so long compulsorily associated, the sweetness and womanly dignity of the heroine stand out with enhanced attractiveness, and we are made to feel throughout that her inner nature loses none of its refinement amid the wild hazards and adventures she is compelled to pass through.

*The Master of Ballantrae.* By ROBERT L. STEVENSON. London : Cassell & Co. 1889.

THIS latest addition to Mr. Stevenson's works is one which only the author of "Kidnapped" could have written. We have the same vivid portraiture of Scotch character, the same gruesome farce of realizing tragic situations as in that heart-stirring tale of the Jacobite rising. Here, however, we find a more sombre plot, and a deeper sounding line for the dark gulfs of human passion. The subject, the rivalry and enmity of two brothers, though as old as the earliest generation of humanity, is a painful, if not a repulsive one, and its gloomy aspect is unredeemed by any softening influences of religion or charity. On the contrary the younger brother, who must be regarded as the hero, is a more depressing study than the Mephistophelian "Master" himself, as we have in him the perversion, through the working of a single evil passion, of a nature originally amiable and unoffending. True, his rapid deterioration is assisted by physical causes, inducing semi-insanity; but even with this suggested apology for his crime, the finale, which leaves him morally guilty of his brother's death, brought about by a train of circumstances deliberately prepared beforehand, is an artistic as well as a moral blemish. The tale is told by a dependent of the family, one Ephraim Mackellar, whose own character, with its combination of uncompromising fidelity with unscrupulousness in his patron's cause, is in itself a masterpiece. His intercourse with the

Master, their relations of avowed hostility softened by a strange intermixture of personal sympathy, and the powers of fascination and diabolical ingenuity in moral torture exercised by the latter, are portrayed with the subtlest penetration into the hidden springs of character. Religion as a restraining power is totally absent from Mr. Stevenson's pages, and his failure to take account of it among the motives acting on human nature leaves a sensible blank in his artistic powers.

---

*An Irish Cousin.* By GEILLES HERRING and MARTIN Ross.  
London : Bentley. 1889.

WE do not remember any novel since "The Collegians" worthy to be ranked with this as a presentment of Irish life and character. The national traits of language and turn of thought are reproduced with all their quaintness, and without that exaggeration by which other writers on the same subject try to make up for the absence of such grasp of the facts as is conferred by perfect knowledge. The scene is laid in the extreme south of the County Cork, within sound of the Atlantic breakers, and the experiences recorded are those of an American girl, Theodora Sarsfield, come for the first time to visit her Irish relatives, a widower uncle and his only son. The society in which she moves is that of the provincial gentry, whose households, manners, and oddities of speech and mind, are all vivid transcripts from life. The Sarsfield *ménage*, in which the fire is encouraged to light by dropping candle-grease on it, and the labour of the recognized domestics is supplemented by a system of "illicit apprenticeship" of the junior members of their families maintained in the establishment without the knowledge of its head, could be paralleled in many an Irish country-house. The hunting-field, the ball with its rollicking drolleries, and all similar social gatherings are equally true to local colouring, while the melancholy minor of Irish life underlies its grotesqueness in the tragic background of the Sarsfield family history, and the dreary figure of the head of the house undermined by the national vice. The romantic interest is conferred by the heroine's love-story, which is as true to nature as the rest of the book, as well as by her relations with her cousin Willy, and the ultimate fate of the latter. The system of dual authorship is in this case, as in so many others, justified by success.

---

*The Secret of Croix-Fontaine.* By MARGARET FIELD. London :  
F. V. White. 1889.

THIS gracefully written narrative recounts the fortunes of a young English girl who enters a French household as teacher and companion to the only daughter, Yvonne de St. Hilaire. Intricate family complications connected with the Revolution have

brought about this young lady's betrothal in childhood to her cousin, the Count of Croix-Fontaine, between whose ancestors and hers there existed mutual relations of dependence and gratitude. Yvonne, childlike though charming, is gradually eclipsed in her fiancé's affections by the more solid gifts of character and sympathy adorning the English girl, but the struggle between loyalty and inclination finally results in his sacrificing the latter, and fulfilling his engagement. The ensuing marriage, if not an ideal, is a fairly happy one, but Yvonne's indiscreet curiosity as to the secret hidden in the disused wing of the old château draws down severe penalties on her household, ending in a conflagration, her mother's death from injuries by fire, and her own from shock and nervous agitation. This is, of course, a fortunate circumstance from the reader's point of view, as it enables the former lovers to be happy with clear consciences, and virtue to enjoy its due reward. The weakest part of the story is the secret of the Bluebeard's Chamber, which is far-fetched and unnatural, giving an air of incongruous melodrama to what is otherwise a charming story of domestic life. The characters are lifelike, and that of the widowed Madame de St. Hilaire, with its innate nobility overshadowed by a tragic memory and a fixed idea bordering on madness, is sympathetically placed before us.

---

*Matron or Maid.* By MRS. EDWARD KENNARD. London :  
F. V. White. 1889.

MRS. KENNARD has chosen a painful and, it may be almost said, a repulsive subject, in the hopeless struggle of a woman past her youth to retain or recall the fugitive attachment of a man several years her junior. A widow with a large jointure, terminable on her second marriage, Lydia Stapleton engages herself to Beaumont Dornay, a young hussar officer, with the intention of marrying him when she has saved a sufficient sum out of her income to supplement his limited means. During the five years required for this process, passed by the fiancé with his regiment in India, the natural result ensues, and he returns to see his boyish flame with eyes from which all illusion has vanished. While recognizing this with a woman's infallible instinct, she refuses to release him, and still continues to insist on the fulfilment of his engagement, even when the growth of another attachment renders it doubly odious to him. The recoil of her passionate nature drives her to attempt his life and finally to take her own, by which tragic solution the way is cleared for his happiness with her rival. English country life and the vicissitudes of the hunting field form episodes of a lighter character in this unpleasant tale, which places the man and woman principally portrayed in an equally degraded and unworthy position.

---

*Captain Lobe.* By JOHN LAW. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889.

THE machinery of the Salvation Army is at least a novelty among the threadbare subjects taken as the foundation of romance. Captain Lobe, the protagonist of the present work, is one of its officers, and the slender thread of story is only the connecting link between the scattered interests illustrative of its operations. As a sketch of East End life in its more gloomy aspects of abject poverty and degradation, it is instructive, though the crude exposition of human misery, and equally crude handling of religious topics, make it rather painful reading. Its claims for the Salvation Army are based on its power of reaching and reclaiming those who are beyond the range of all other influences, and the picture of its ministrations tend to show it as holding the field in quarters where no more regular religious organization can succeed in penetrating. We make no doubt that, despite the travesty of sacred observance which renders it repulsive to the reverent-minded of all creeds, there are many earnest workers in the cause of charity among its ranks.

---

*The Heritage of Dedlow Marsh.* By BRET HARTE. London: Macmillan. 1889.

THESE two volumes of sketches, rather than tales, have that quality of aerial perspective which is the author's peculiar characteristic. Mr. Bret Harte's transcripts of border life are never presented to us with bald definiteness, but carry with them their own atmosphere of artistic illusion. The first narrative of this series draws a sharp contrast between the picturesque savagery of life on the marsh, and its more conventional aspects as displayed in the neighbouring military station, the exchange of the one for the other being attended with anything but happy results to the untrained natures suddenly brought into contact with artificial civilization. "The Secret of Telegraph Hill" is a semi-humorous episode, in which a new lodger inherits some of the embarrassing complications left by his predecessor, and adds to them a small romance of his own. The two shorter stories are not above the ordinary level of magazine padding, as in "A Don Quixote of the Foot Hills" the humour, and in "Captain Jim's Friend" the pathos, are alike exaggerated.

---

*Paul's Sister.* By FRANCES MARY PEARD. London: Bentley. 1889.

MISS PEARD has woven a life-like and charming tale out of the relations, often recurring under various phases in real life, between unscrupulous selfishness on the one side, and exaggerated self-abnegation on the other. The heroine is a widow rejoicing in

the stage-hallowed name of Norma, and the anti-heroine a certain Lucy, her unmarried sister-in-law, with the charge of whom she has burdened herself out of a sense of duty to her husband's memory. The prologue, which tells the story of her brief honeymoon in Rome, and of the artistic delight in all its treasures and associations which closed her eyes to the fatal malady undermining her husband's life, gives the key to the subsequent action in the feeling of remorse for her carelessness suggesting self-immolation as a reparation to his memory. Her insensibility indeed to his condition, although rather stupid than culpable, certainly argued an amount of absorption in her own interests scarcely consistent with real attachment or with the devotion of her character as unfolded later. When she and Paul's sister become rivals for the affection that is bestowed on her alone, the machinations of the girl and her own morbid self-accusations lead her to sacrifice, not only her own happiness, but that of the man who adores her as well. The late relenting of her cruel tormentor by which these complications are at length smoothed away, seems to us another false note in characterization, as a feline tenacity which never relaxes its hold on its prey generally accompanies such strong but narrow natures. Among the incidental characters the most interesting is that of Major MacCarthy, the unpractical but lovable Irishmen, whose universal power of sympathy gives his seemingly useless life such a value to those around him. We cannot, however, shut our eyes to the fact that his sister-in-law had some grounds for thinking him a very dangerous financial adviser.

---

*A Conspiracy of Silence.* By G. COLMORE. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1889.

A PAINFUL theme is here treated with power, pathos, and we may add perfectly artistic taste, without any of the melodramatic artifices which make up what the public have agreed to call sensationalism. The subject is the highly tragic one of a young man, gifted and rich in all external advantages, but tainted with the dreadful blight of hereditary insanity, already incipient in his system, though showing at the opening of the story only in a certain whimsical gaiety of manner rather attractive than the reverse. The heroine, Charlotte March, a fresh and delightful ideal of girlhood, is naturally all unconscious of the doom awaiting her future husband, when his love lifts her from poverty to affluence, and enables her to exchange the drudgery of daily tuitions for a life of luxury and pleasure. The secret drawback to all these advantages is made known to her mother before the marriage, but deliberately concealed by her through worldly ambition for her daughter, and a selfish desire on her own behalf to participate in the brilliant prospects opening before her. The second volume follows the fortunes of the pair united under these circumstances, and deals with the gradual development of the fell disease through all its phases. The author

has shown consummate skill in treating this difficult part of his subject, and deserves the highest praise for dwelling exclusively on the moral aspects of the situation, while refraining from such scenes of physical violence as a coarser artist might have used to heighten its effect. The analysis of the unhappy hero's character and feelings is masterly, as he passes from the stages of partial excitement, alternating with struggles for self-control, to that of absolute and hopeless insanity. The highest level of poetic emotion is reached in the end, which, unlike that of most modern novels, worthily "crowns the work."

---

*Allan's Wife.* By H. RIDER HAGGARD. London: Spencer Blackett. 1889.

THE expectations of the readers of Mr. Rider Haggard on opening a new volume with his name on the title-page will not be disappointed in the present instance, as they will find quite the average allowance of danger, adventure, hairbreadth escapes, and slaughter of man and beast. Elephants, lions, baboons, and other fauna of the African wilds abound on its pages, and we have a Zulu impi and the resulting carnage described with the author's usual vivid power of narration. Our old friend, Allan Quatermain, figures as the hero throughout, and the most substantial part of the volume is occupied with the story of his wooing, and the brief episode of his married life. The romance, however, is subsidiary to the *sauce piquante* of livelier incidents, which give it the necessary flavour of excitement, and the reader craving for a novel relish of this kind will find one in the strange history of Hendrika, the baboon-woman. The old Zulu wizard, "Indabo-zimbi," is, however, a happier conception, and deserves to be remembered with those types of native character in which the author excels. The opening scene of the invocation of the lightning by the rival "cloud-compellers" of Zululand is founded on truth, or at least on what passed as such in the South African newspapers a year ago. The real incident was the dramatic death of a Zulu killed by a flash of lightning at the door of his hut, in the act of defying the storm to strike him, a piece of bravado, it seems, common among his countrymen.

---

*The County.* A Novel. Two Vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1889.

A N anonymous writer has produced a bright and brief story dealing with two young ladies. They were living happily with their uncle, and enjoying all that "County" society can give, when, one fell morning, their treacherous uncle married their maid! Fleeing from the house, they had to eat the bread of dependence. One, the narrator of the story, fell in love with a fine-looking man,

who was unfortunately poor ; a forged message parts them, and she (with violent disgust and misgiving) marries a rich city man. The fine-looking man (after, as usual, leaving England for ever) comes back, having inherited several millions—(at least, that is our impression). All is explained (in the peach-house one morning), and there are some violent attempts on the part of the fine-looking man to seize the young lady in his arms, in spite of her married state. But she is good—the whole tone of the book is good, in spite of the somewhat unpleasant situation thus created. The city man is killed in a railway accident, the heroine has the regulation brain-fever, the fine-looking man nurses her (more or less), and they are married “very quietly.” It must not be forgotten that the other young lady—the narrator’s sister—is what Miss Dartle would call a “serpent,” and is at the bottom of all the mischief. “County” inanities are described in a lively and amusing way. The style is unusually excellent, with an under-current of humour ; whilst the principal characters—at least the female ones—are cleverly and distinctly marked.

## Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

### FRENCH PERIODICALS.

*Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques*, Août et Septembre 1887; Septembre 1888; Mars, Avril, et Mai 1889. Paris: Roger et Chernoviz.

**The Abbé Martin and 1 John v. 7.**—When the late Cardinal Franzelin wrote his treatise *De Deo Trino*, he devoted a special thesis to defending the authenticity of the well-known seventh verse of the fifth chapter of 1 John—“And there are three that give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : and these three are one.” The Cardinal, in his thesis, alluded to some Catholic writers, who, after the appearance of Scholz’s edition of the New Testament, “had deemed it allowable (*fas esse putant*) to doubt the genuineness of the text, while others had openly rejected” it as spurious. Since then, various critics of undoubted orthodoxy have joined the ranks of the wavering, and during the years 1888-89 have appeared a number of articles on the subject in this *Revue*, several of them from the pen of one of the most eminent Catholic Biblical scholars, the celebrated Abbé Martin. These demand special attention on account of the author’s great and deserved reputation in Biblical studies. The Abbé declares himself absolutely convinced,

as the result of twenty years' careful research, that the verse in question is an interpolation. I shall here condense the Abbé's arguments, doing my best to give them their full force and weight; but it may be as well to state at once that I dissent from his conclusion, though I look on it as a distinct gain to the cause of truth that we should have the advantage of hearing an attack on the genuineness of the verse made by such a thorough Catholic, able writer, and eminent scholar as the Abbé J. P. Martin.

As becomes a devoted son of the Catholic Church, Abbé Martin opens by professing what he justly calls the A B C of Catholicism—that should the Church at any future time pronounce the verse in question authentic, then every true Catholic, even though his private study had led him to a different conclusion, would unhesitatingly admit, believe, and proclaim that his imperfect human learning had failed in some point or other, and had misled him; and that such a confession would be as worthy of a man of science as of a good Catholic. This is as it should be; and in the present controversy between Catholics this is of course a fundamental principle on both sides. It is this very security of our trust in the Church's infallibility that in many instances gives a Catholic theologian greater freedom in discussion than many a good Anglican could venture on. In stating the Abbé Martin's case, we will allow ourselves the liberty of altering his order of the headings to be considered. These are reducible to three: the Greek text with its Eastern versions; the Latin translations; and finally, the question as to whether the authenticity of the text is in any way directly or indirectly affected by the decrees of the Council of Trent.

**The Greek Text and Eastern Versions.**—Abbé Martin's chief attack on the authenticity of 1 John v. 7 rests on its absence from existing Greek and Oriental MSS., and is stated with the utmost clearness and vigour. The verse, he says, if we lay aside for the moment the Latin Church and Latin writers, was absolutely unknown to all the Churches of the Christian world and to all ecclesiastical literature during the first twelve centuries. It is alike unheard of among Greeks, Armenians, Copts, and Syrians down to the thirteenth century. No Greek, Syriac, Coptic, or Armenian MS. of the Scripture contains it; no theologian, no writer of homilies or commentaries on the Bible knows aught of it. Such a passage, however, would have been of such immense value in the protracted and fierce Arian controversy that this silence of Catholic writers is a proof of overwhelming force. In all the commentaries written on St. John's Epistles this all-important verse 7, as well as the words *in terra* ("on earth") of verse 8 are omitted in a way that shows plainly the commentators had no such verse in the codex before them. The fact, Abbé Martin says, is indisputable. Not till the thirteenth century does it begin to make its appearance in Greek authors, and it is probably from the Greek translation of the acts of the Lateran Council (1215) that the knowledge of the text reached the East. The four Greek MSS. of the New Testament, those of Rome, Naples,

Berlin and Dublin, wherein the passage is found, are all of more recent date.

Such is Abbé Martin's contention; and it is an undeniably strong one. As regards the Greek MSS. it is absolutely unquestioned at the present day, as, indeed, it was when Cardinal Franzelin wrote. This is itself a point of great weight. So likewise is, I believe, undisputed Abbé Martin's assertion as to the Oriental versions, even if, as has been affirmed, one or two exceptions are to be found among Coptic MSS., which, if so, would probably have been derived from Latin sources. The admitted silence of Greek commentators is a powerful corroboration of the argument from the MSS. against the authenticity of the verse. In a word, had we none but extant Eastern authorities to decide the question, the verse must unhesitatingly be given up. Less than this we cannot grant to Abbé Martin.

Having granted so much and granted it willingly, is there absolutely nothing to be said on the opposite side, even as regards the weight of the argument drawn from the Eastern Church? I believe there is. First of all, the silence of Greek writers is not without an exception or two. In the *Dublin Review* for April 1882 two such exceptions are quoted—one from the fourth, and the other from the second century. The former occurs in an anonymous writer, whose Homily was printed by the Benedictine editors of St. Chrysostom (T. xii. p. 416), and its date was fixed by Montfaucon at 381. To me it seems conclusive, though I have my doubts whether it is of such clearness as to render all dispute at once impossible. More striking still is the passage given from St. Claudius Apollinaris, wherein side by side, in the same order as in St. John, appear "Water and Blood; the Word and the Spirit." These two extremely probable exceptions would, however, hardly be convincing if our proofs rested on Greek authorities alone.

A more serious weakness in Abbé Martin's reasoning will be understood from the following comparison. Had we at hand a considerable number of MSS. in each century from the earliest up to the thirteenth, and in every one of these the verse 1 John v. 7 were missing, his arguments would be simply unanswerable. But how does the case really stand? For the first, second, and third centuries we have not a single copy of the Greek New Testament, and all the eight centuries up to the time of Charles the Great only furnish us with about half a dozen. Everyone sees at a glance the different weight of the induction in the two hypotheses. Still, his argument is a powerful one by itself. Let us now see how it stands when other sources of information come to be sifted.

**1 John v. 7 in the Latin Scriptures and Literature.**—With equal vigour, but, to our mind, not so successfully, Abbé Martin attacks the alleged tradition of the Latin Church on the verse 1 John v. 7. Let us hear him state his own case first. We agree with him that the proofs of this tradition must be closely and carefully scrutinized. Starting from the eleventh century (so writes Abbé Martin), the verse is frequently met with in Latin writers. But if we look for it

at an earlier date, we nowhere find it expressly quoted or clearly acknowledged except by a group of writers belonging to the African Church, all of whom lived either at the close of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth century. It was the time when the Catholics of Africa were groaning under the persecution of the Arian Vandals. During fifty years of persecution, a complete controversial literature saw the light, composed of works on the Catholic side, mostly of uncertain authorship, being either anonymous or written under feigned names. As might be expected, most of these writings were concerned with the Catholic dogma of the Blessed Trinity, and it is precisely in these books that the supposed spurious verse 1 John v. 7 makes its first appearance. Between the years 480 and 533, we find it quoted four times by the Pseudo-Fulgentius, once by the Pseudo-Idacius Clarus, six times by a writer who assumed the name of St. Athanasius, and once by the Pseudo-Victor; in all, twelve quotations in half a century, all in the African Church, after which we hear little or nothing more of the interpolation for the next five hundred years, even in the African Church.

More remarkable still is it that in all St. Augustine's works this striking testimony to the revealed dogma of the Blessed Trinity is nowhere to be found. The whole of the Epistle has been reconstructed from quotations by St. Augustine, save this one verse. Père Sabatier, an ardent defender of its authenticity, remarks that St. Augustine explains verse 8 immediately following, as having been written in a mystic sense of the Blessed Trinity, and justly concludes that the holy Doctor never saw verse 7. When one reflects that the writings wherein the verse appears are all literary impostures ("supercheries littéraires"), in which class we shall perhaps have to reckon even the Profession of Faith of the 466 African bishops assembled at Carthage in 484, the authority of the African Fathers dwindles down to *nil*. And it must be remembered that before the epoch referred to, it is impossible to find a single clear, express, undisputed quotation of the passage. The few passages alleged from St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, and Tertullian, have nothing in them that obliges us to accept them as allusions to 1 John v. 7, rather than as a mystical interpretation of verse 8, such as we find in St. Augustine and others. And if we look round on the rest of the Catholic world, we find no trace of the spurious verse till we reach the close of the eighth century, when it again peeps out, first in a doubtful form, till at last in the thirteenth century, the "Correctio Parisiensis," as the edition of the Vulgate made by the University of Paris has been called, aided by the authority of the Cistercian, Cluniac, and Dominican correctors, caused the verse of the three heavenly witnesses to spread over the whole of the Latin Church. The Italian, English or German students at the Parisian University would, of course, take home with them the copies of the Bible which they had purchased from the "Stationarii" (compare our English word "stationers") or authorized booksellers at the Cloître-Notre-Dame or the Montagne-Sainte-Geneviève.

But how about the ancient Latin MSS. of the New Testament? Among such as are older than the age of Charles the Great, the best and most esteemed ignore 1 John v. 7. Neither in the Fuldensis, nor in the Amiatinus, nor in any of Alcuin's Bibles is it to be found. The oldest MS. in which it appears is Theodulph's Bible, numbered 9380 in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Out of some 300 MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, 21 do not contain the verse in question; viz.: 7 out of 10 ninth century MSS.; 3 out of 4 belonging to the tenth century; 3 out of 5 of the eleventh; 2 out of 15 of the thirteenth; and only 4 out of 118 of the fourteenth centuries, and so on, till it is gradually in vogue everywhere.

Whether or not we adopt the Abbé Martin's conclusion that the authenticity of this verse is no longer defensible, it is impossible to read without interest and profit his learned and brilliant dissertation. To us this part of his essay lacks some elements needed to carry conviction with it; I may even add that it rather tends to increase my own confidence in the authenticity of the passage to see that even so vigorous an opponent as Abbé Martin could not make out a stronger case. What I think the frail links in Abbé Martin's chain of evidence are, in this portion of the controversy, four in number; 1. His criticism of the African writers; 2. His treatment of the "Professio Fidei" of A.D. 484; 3. The dismissal of St. Cyprian's authority, and of that of Tertullian; 4. And lastly, his too sweeping assertion that the verse in question is confined, till the eleventh century, to the African Church.

1. Let us begin with the African writers. Owing to the hot persecution of the Arian conquerors they were compelled to write under feigned names. In this sense they were what Abbé Martin calls *supercheries littéraires*, though he hesitates to affirm this of the author of the book published under the name of St. Fulgentius. But be this as it may, neither Abbé Martin nor any one else denies that the writers of these works were Catholics, writing in defence of the Catholic faith, against Arians whose works were published in Africa, while the Arian heresy was raging there. Is it probable, is it even possible, that these fervent and staunch champions should have been so forgetful of the fundamental principles of the Faith as to forge a spurious text of Scripture? As the writings in question are not by one, but by several authors, they must have drawn from a common source, and that source must almost of necessity have been well known and acknowledged in the African Church, else the Arian Bishops would have instantly denounced the forgery. In a word, to admit Abbé Martin's theory, and affirm the verse 1 John v. 7 to have been unknown before this date, is to find ourselves beset with serious difficulties; and if the African writers drew from earlier sources, how far back are we to go?

2. Harder still to digest is the reasoning whereby Abbé Martin disposes of the authority of the "Professio Fidei" of the African Bishops. This celebrated document purports to be a writing drawn up by the Catholic Bishops "non solum universa Africæ sed etiam

"insularum multarum," in a conference held at Carthage by order of Hunneric in February 484, and sent two months later to Hunneric himself by four bishops of the Numidian and Byzacene Provinces. The document may be seen in Victor Vitensis (*De Persecutione Vandalica*, c. iii.), and the names of the 461 bishops who signed it, in Hardouin (*Concil. Coll. T. ii.*, p. 896.). Among the passages of Scripture quoted therein against the Arian heresy, is 1 John v. 7, given as it is at this present day in the Vulgate. Now let us first suppose the fact to be historically true, and the document genuine. Then such a text must have existed in the Latin Scriptures as in use in Africa at that date. The contrary supposition in a public document directed to the Arian king, by whose bishops the fraud would have been instantly exposed, is not tenable for a moment, nor can one conceive it even possible that in such circumstances 460 Catholic bishops would have appealed to a passage which only existed in some exceptional MS. Moreover one of the bishops whose name appears on the list, Vigilius Tapsensis (*De Trin. c vii. Bibl. Max. PP., T. viii.*, p. 789), appeals to the Arians to read the said verse in their own codices.

Such is the passage admitted, at least usually, as genuine, and quoted as such by so eminent a scholar as Cardinal Franzelin. Against this Abbé Martin writes : "Il y a de nombreuses raisons qui font suspecter l'authenticité de cette profession de foi, raisons externes et raisons internes." Now that a writer should publicly assert that in his own day a public conference of 461 bishops should have drawn up and signed a profession of faith, and should give the 461 names, when no such profession was ever drawn up or signed, would be at the least a singular and wonderful fact on the side of the Catholic Church in its days of persecution. But in face of numerous internal and external arguments, we are prepared to suspend or alter our judgment. Unhappily, Abbé Martin has kept them nearly all to himself, and has only thought it necessary to give us the following. 1. The style of the *libellus* is a rhetorical one, more like "un traité de théologie" than a profession of faith. 2. The verse 1 John v. 7, has not been quoted by St. Augustine, nor by Facundus Hermianus. Not one single argument more of the "nombreuses raisons!" To my mind the authenticity of the *libellus* and of Victor's account remains after such objections as certain as before; and the African bishops assuredly read the verse in the Latin text in use in Africa in 484. If so, the principles of Catholic tradition create a very strong antecedent probability that it had come down from a much earlier date. In fact St. Fulgentius, or the African Father who wrote under his name, appeals to St. Cyprian's quotation of this very passage : "atque haec confessim testimonia de Scripturis inseruit (Cyprianus) : Dicit Dominus, Ego et Pater unus sumus ; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est : Et tres unum sunt." This leads us on to what appears to be another of the Abbé Martin's weak points.

3. St. Cyprian (*De Unitate Ecclesie*), quotes the verse in a

manner that certainly justifies the above appeal to his authority by St. Fulgentius. For brevity and clearness I put S. Cyprian's words, as well as Tertullian's (*Contra Praxeam*, 25), in parallel columns, thus :—

VULGATE.	CYPRIAN.	TERTULLIAN.
Pater, Verbum et Spiritus Sanctus : et hi tres unum sunt	De Patre et Filio et Spiritu SCRIP- TUM EST ; et tres unum sunt	Connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paraclete qui tres unum sunt

Few unbiased readers comparing the African Fathers in the third, with those of the fifth century, but will conclude that the verse was read in Africa from the earliest times. The Abbé Martin however, says : "dans mon âme et conscience je crois que Saint Cyprien n'a fait qu' interpreter mystiquement de la Sainte Trinité, le verset 8." St. Fulgentius has, I believe, understood St. Cyprian better than Abbé Martin, and one may surely conclude that St. Cyprian read the passage in the African MSS. in the third century, just as the African Fathers did in the fifth. There is a cumulative force of evidence that must not be neglected in matters like the present, and it is precisely this cumulative force that lends a weight, even to the passage of Tertullian, which it would not have by itself. But what makes it impossible to admit Abbé Martin's way of getting rid of St. Cyprian, is, that the holy bishop couples this quotation with another, "The Lord saith : I and the Father are One ; and again *it is written* concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. And these three are one." The first is a quotation, according to Abbé Martin, but not the second ! And mark that we have not a hint of a reference to "the Spirit, the water and the Word." Tertullian also couples the "Ego et Pater unum sumus" with the "tres unum sunt."

4. Lastly, it is difficult to accept the Abbé's sweeping assertion as to the ignorance of the text outside of the Churches of Africa. The passage of Cassiodorus is again, like St. Cyprian's, explained away as an instance of mystical interpretation ; this suggestion being as improbable in one case as in the other. It is far more likely that Cassiodorus read the passage in the MSS. in use in Italy. Then there is St. Phæbadius of Agen, writing in France in the fourth century. The Munich MS. and the Prologue *Non ita est Ordo* (about A.D. 500), have been ably and well maintained in the already quoted number of the *Dublin Review*. On the whole, it would need stronger arguments than Abbé Martin's to shake Cardinal Franzelin's conclusion : "Extabat textus et a Patribus in Africa, Italia, Hispania, Gallia usurpatus demonstratur ab octavo usque ad secundum aut tertium saeculum regrediendo."

**Bearing of the Decrees of Trent on the authenticity of the verse.**—We now come to a part of the controversy which, we regret to say, has given rise to some slightly acrimonious writing in the pages of the *Revue*. The bearing of the decrees of the Council of Trent on the authenticity of 1 John, v. 7, had been a primary argu-

ment in Cardinal Franzelin's treatise, and is strongly urged against Abbé Martin by his two opponents, Canon Maunoury, and Abbé Rambouillet.\* We are cordially with Abbé Martin in his earnest protest against such as would anticipate, in their own over hasty zeal, the definitions and decisions of the Church, and also when he insists, as indeed Cardinal Franzelin had already insisted, that the words "cum omnibus suis partibus" used by the Council of Trent in its approval of the Latin Vulgate, cannot without manifest and dangerous error be taken in the strictest sense. I should like even *apropos* of this last to mention that more than one Catholic theologian, Abbé le Camus, for instance, in his "*Vie de Jésus Christ*," published with episcopal approval, in commenting on the cure of the paralytic at the Probatice (S. John, chap. v.), have without hesitation rejected as an interpolation the whole of v. 4, and part of v. 3, and this without any censure from ecclesiastical authority. The Abbé Martin proceeds to combat the doctrine contained in Cardinal Franzelin's thesis on the relation of the Tridentine decree to 1 John, v. 7; yet he has not, as it seems to me, quite fairly met his adversary. The Cardinal distinctly affirms that the definition of the Council commanding us to receive as sacred and canonical all the books contained in the Tridentine canon, "with all their parts, *prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur*," comprises the verse in question, 1. John, v. 7. Before adducing his proofs, he takes exception to a line of argument which had been sometimes adopted on this, and on a similar question (viz., the authenticity of the deutero-canonical parts of Scripture), of *first* submitting the passages to an historical and critical examination, then *secondly*, deciding on these arguments (of human authority), whether the text is genuine or not; and then, *lastly*, interpreting the sense of the Tridentine decree to be simply that those passages, or parts, be admitted as genuine, the authority whereof has been proved by the said critical investigation, thereby establishing the very principle of private judgment which the Council intended to exclude.

After rejecting this method of procedure, the Cardinal lays down as his first principle that the text of the Council itself be carefully examined. The decree of the fourth Session contains four parts: 1. It mentions the twofold channel of divine truth, Scripture and Tradition; 2. it enumerates the books which constitute the canon of Scripture; 3. it decrees that these books be received as sacred and canonical "with all their parts," adding a twofold test of authenticity, to wit (*a*) the custom of the church in publicly reading as scripture such books and such parts of them, and (*b*) the fact that they are contained in the Latin Vulgate: "*prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt et in veteri vulgata editione habentur*,"

---

\* *L'authenticité du verset des trois témoins célestes.* Par M. l'Abbé Rambouillet. *Le verset des trois témoins célestes.* Par le chanoine A. Maunoury.

and it assigns as the object of the decree, that all may recognize the divine authority of the sources from which the Council intends to proceed "for the confirming of dogma and upholding of morals." Now, although it is an acknowledged fact, that the decree in question never intended to adjudge to the Vulgate absolute perfection, as has been already remarked, yet such a definition manifestly requires that it should be incorrupt in such passages as concern of themselves some dogma of faith.

Moreover, it is manifest that the verse in question is one of those that were in the Vulgate at the time of the Council of Trent. It is also perfectly clear that it deals *ex professo* with a point of dogma. Therefore it must come under the definition, unless the Council is to be supposed to have failed in the avowed scope of its decree. Such is Cardinal Franzelin's argument in brief.

Abbé Martin's reply is hardly satisfactory. First of all his idea of the scope of the Council seems hardly what the Council itself claims. "En donnant aux fidèles et au clergé la Vulgate ils ont singlément affirmé ceci : Cette édition des Saintes Ecritures est bonne, cette édition est suffisante. Prenez en toute confiance le livre que nous vous mettons entre les mains, parcourez-le, aimez-le, faites en votre nourriture et vous n'y trouverez rien qui aille contre la foi et les moeurs." Is this really all the Council intends? To Cardinal Franzelin's argument he replies : "Il a cherché et il a découvert . . . une seconde Amérique, celle des *textes dogmatiques*. . . . Le Cardinal Franzelin raisonnait ainsi. Le concile commence par faire connaître les sources où il prendra ses textes, et il déclare qu'il les puisera dans la Vulgate. Donc les textes dogmatiques font partie de la Vulgate!" If Abbé Martin had only added from Cardinal Franzelin and the Council itself after the words *ses textes*, the words *pro confirmandis dogmatibus*, the argument would have been more fairly put. In a word, it does seem strange to appeal to the Vulgate as a source wherewith to confirm dogmas, and yet to admit that those very passages in the Vulgate which express the dogmas in question may be interpolations.

This brief account of Abbé Martin's essay has been given with the idea that it is of importance to show what look like ruinous flaws in the case against the verse of the Three Divine Witnesses, as stated by its latest and ablest opponent; and still more to give an outline of the controversy in its present phase. The theory of the supporters of the verse is, of course, that although the verse in the fourth century disappeared from all the Greek MSS. (and we have no earlier ones), yet it existed in the earlier ones from which the Latin translators made their version. The mutilation is supposed to have been the work of the Arian Eusebius, who had been charged with the revision of the Greek text. Abbé Martin denies the possibility of a universal disappearance on any such hypothesis. But the answer given by Canon Maunoury, who brings forward a parallel instance, and an undoubted one, makes it seem as if here once more our author had been too hasty. The example is taken

from the immediately preceding chapter of this identical epistle. 1 John iv. 3. All extant Greek MSS. have in this place  $\mu\eta$  δομολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν (non confitetur Jesum), whereas the Vulgate translator must have read λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν as he translates it solvit Jesum. Now though we have all the extant Greek MSS. against the Vulgate, yet it is certain that the Vulgate represents the earlier and genuine reading. This is proved not only on the explicit authority of the historian Socrates who had read it in older MSS., and informs us that the corruption had been made by the Nestorians, but likewise from the fact that Origen and Irenaeus read it as it is now in the Vulgate, and quote it in the same manner.

ADAM HAMILTON, O.S.B.

### BELGIAN.

*Dietsche Warande. Tijdschrift voor Kunst en Zedegeschiedenis.*  
No. 5.

**The Soup Bowl of St. Francis.**—Children of St. Francis all the world over will be pleased with the engraving of the soup-bowl of the Seraphic Father, still existing in the Franciscanesses' Convent at Retie, and the description of it by Fr. Th. J. Welvaarts, in No. 5 of this excellent Flemish art review. Retie, we may remark, is in the province of Antwerp, some two hours' walk from Turnhout and three from Geel. The engraving shows the bowl, or cup, which is considerably broken, mounted in a silver holder, which bears an inscription in Latin. As Fr. Welvaarts' article is very short, we give a translation of it, as follows :

This earthenware bowl has a circumference at its upper rim of 36 centimetres, with a diameter of ten, and a height, including the silver foot subsequently added, of 7 centimetres; the whole weight is half a kilo (1½ lb.) The whitish bottom, much cracked and with the mark of a cross baked into it, has an inner circumference of 32 centimetres. The colour outside is marbled green. There are still traces on the outside indicating an earlier handle. There are fastened to the upper part, in the form of handles, two little figures in worked silver, 4½ centimetres in size, representing St. Francis with uplifted arms, as if striving to soar up from earth and be united to God. They were added at a more recent time, when the greater part of the bowl was encased in silver, and of course have nothing to do with the original object. Through the intermediary of Mgr. Canon Wijnants, custodian of the relics at Mechlin, the following words were in 1889 engraved on the silver band put round the bowl in the 18th century, and are based on irrefragable documentary evidence :

HAEC SCUTELLA TESTACEA, QUA IPSE DIVUS FRANCISCUS, DUM VIVERET,  
AD JUSCULENTA UTEBATUR, AB ANNO 1232 USQUE AD 1796 MECHLINIAE  
IN CONVENTU FRATRUM MINORUM RECOLLECTORUM CONSERVATA, A SUPER-  
STITE PATRE JOANNE BRUGMANS ANNO 1837 CONVENTUI SORORUM POENI-  
TENTIUM IN ARENDONCK LEGATA.

How the bowl was brought from Italy to Mechlin six years after the death of the Founder of the Order, we can find recorded neither in documents nor in tradition. But according to the above inscription, it was kept in

Mechlin at the Convent of the Friars Minors for nearly six centuries, viz., from 1237 to 1796, and since the time of the suppression of the Monastery always kept in a place of safety, now by one spiritual son of St. Francis, now by another. Fr. John Brugmans was the last survivor of the above convent. After the expulsion, he fixed his abode at Mechlin in the house of Madame Koninckx (died Nov., 1884), where at this time the bowl was kept. Sister Maria Antonia (in the world, Catherine Schellens, born at Olmen, Jan. 25, 1768) was a great friend of this lady and had often seen the venerable relic at her house. Fr. Brugmans, when nearing the end of his life, thought he could leave the bowl to nobody better than to Sister M. Antonia, or, rather, to the Arendonck Convent, which she had begun to erect in 1819. That this sister, who was the Mother General of all the convents founded by her in the archdiocese of Mechlin, had a great devotion for this bowl, is evident from the fact, among others, that she always carried it with her in a leather case when she visited her houses, and gave the nuns great pleasure by letting them see it.

Why is this ancient relic now transferred from the Franciscan Convent at Arendonck to the neighbouring convent at Retie?

The bowl was indeed bequeathed in 1837 by Fr. Brugmans to St. Agnes' Convent, Arendonck, but chiefly in favour of Sister M. Antonia. The Mother General had a special affection for the then poor (and, indeed, still poor) house at Retie, known as St. Annadal, which she used to call her Bethlehem, and where she hoped to breathe her soul to God. Only four days before her death, when completely recovered from the attack of ague, she arrived at Retie from Arendonck, never more to leave it. After a very short sickness, she passed into eternal life at Retie, on June 12, 1850. Her wish was fulfilled. It was considered just that the bowl should be kept at Retie. No house of the order raised any objection.

A word about the various cracks, which can be clearly seen in the engraving. The written description of the breakage at the Arendonck Convent has been lost, but we can supply it by the evidence of some old sisters, who had often read the documents.

According to them, the bowl was already broken, before the dissolution of convents in the 18th century. For an old woman, who was dangerously sick, wishing to drink out of it so as to recover her health, let it slip from her hands, with the unfortunate result that it broke into nine pieces. The Friars Minors joined the pieces together and encased the whole in the silver band described above. Thus the relic 700 years old, was protected from further injury.

**VARIOUS PAPERS.**—Other numbers of the *Dietsche Warande* (Nos. 2, 3, 4) contain exceedingly valuable contributions, antiquarian and artistic, which we can refer to only briefly. Dom Willibrord Van Heteren, O.S.B., of Maredsous, has in Nos. 4 and 5, an article on "Artists and Works of Art in the Belgian Monasteries from the 10th to the Middle of the 13th Century," giving most interesting details of art-life at Waulsort, Gembloux, and St. Hubert.—Tottmann has a couple of articles (Nos. 5 and 6) tracing the history of "Musical Notation."—Two MSS. printed here for the first time are both instructive and amusing. F. Kieckers, S.J., of Louvain, edits a quaint little treatise on the art of illuminating ("af setten van perkamenten genaemt mingnaturen"), drawn up by Brother Francis of Groenendaal in 1642, at the request of "the well-beloved Dominus Adrianus," whoever that was. Groenendaal was one of the convents of

the congregation to which Thomas à Kempis belonged. The minute instructions given by the good brother for each kind of colour, and for the treatment of different kinds of objects, flesh-tints, hair, coats of animals, &c., are very interesting, and possibly might be found exceedingly useful to modern illuminators. Here is a curious bit :

*Mumia or Mummy.*—Mummy is men's flesh, which is found in the mountains of Babylon or Ninive and Egypt, embalmed and quite dried up, but still preserved by the balsam which grows in the land. It can be bought at apothecaries and druggists ("inde abtekerijen ende drogisten"). It must be rubbed in clean water, and let to dry on chalk. It is a convenient colour for hair and beards. *Item* for naked men and dead bodies; also for mountains and rocks.

The MS. of Brother Francis is in the private archives of the della Faille family at Antwerp.

From a MS. of the Royal Library at Brussels, M. Stallaert publishes a very curious little poem of Jan Boendale, a satire upon women's vagaries, and above all upon female fashions in dress, which at that epoch (14th century) seem to have been particularly extravagant. It seems, by the way, that in 1379 the Flemish ladies talked of their "frox" just as they do in England in 1890. The satire is very amusing, and in the quaintest old Flemish. All birds and animals, grumbles Jan, are content with the form and figure God has given them ; not so our wives :

For Nature, according to Her right,  
Gave them only a head ;  
But thereto they add a great horn.  
I wear they do it in God's scorn !  
And come to church and to feasts  
Horned like senseless beasts . . .  
Were they born, however,  
With horns, they'd be ashamed  
And cover themselves where they grew !      [ll. 25-34.]

They drag after them long trains  
Like serpents, three ells long.      [ll. 66, 67]

Moreover, they will always have their own way, out of pure "cussedness," as a modern Yankee would put it :

Her husband's 'yea' is her 'nay,'  
And her husband's 'nay' is her 'yea.'  
When the husband wants to drink wine,  
Then she will have beer served ;  
Will he beer, so wills she wine ! . . .  
If meat is to be cooked,  
If he wants it roast, she'll have it boiled ;  
If he wants beef, she wants pork.      [ll. 104-117.]

Judging from some of the verses, we fancy Jan Boendale must have been soured by his experiences of wedded life !

L. C. C.

VOL. XXIII.—NO. I. [*Third Series.*]      N

## GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Canon BELLESHEIM, of Aachen.

1. *Katholik.*

**I**N the September issue of the *Katholik*, Father Athanasius Zimmermann, of Ditton Hall, contributes a thoughtful paper on the condition of English Catholics under James I. He shows that Gardiner in his "History of England" goes too far in exculpation of James I., when he pretends that the king never deviated from his first promise of affording complete toleration to all denominations, provided they did not enter into any conspiracy against the Crown. On the contrary, the truth seems to be with the opinion which fathers the original plan of persecuting English Catholics on the king himself. James could let Anglican bishops and State ministers apparently constrain him, whilst he quietly organized intolerant measures. Certainly notwithstanding his solemn assurance to the Catholic Ambassadors that the penal laws had been passed against his will, he allowed those laws to be severely enacted. Another article in this number treats of the numerous translations of relics from Rome to Germany in the time of Charlemagne. From Giovanni de Rossi's archaeological works we know that, owing to the barbarous inroads of the Lombards, the Popes, during the eighth century, had the bodies of Catacomb martyrs transferred into churches of the city. The close connection between Rome and Germany under the Empire of A.D. 800, gave opportunity of providing German churches, both cathedrals and convents, with bodies of martyrs from the Catacombs. We may be allowed to quote the opinion of a Protestant historian, Professor Wallenbach, as to the influence of such proceedings. In the introduction to the German edition of the book, "the translation of St. Alexander," he does not hesitate to assert "that the translation of sacred and venerated relics proved most conducive to the establishment of the Christian religion." The student of liturgy and hagiology will find abundant material in this article. A series of articles in this review treats of the "Manuale Curatorum, A.D. 1514," an excellent manual of advice to parish priests in the discharge of their duties. The book is of special interest as practically refuting so many accusations soon afterwards brought forward by the reformers against the Catholic Church. In the October number, a recent essay which attempts to defend the theory of "Generatianismus" is deservedly dealt with. Next follows an article on "St. Thomas and the course of studies adopted by the Society of Jesus," clearly establishing that the Jesuits from their commencement made it their most sacred duty to adhere to St. Thomas as their guide.

From the November issue we select the article on "Luther's Bible." An undertaking akin to the revised version in England, has

been started in Germany in the scheme for bringing out a new edition of Luther's Bible. The time is happily gone by when Luther's translation was extolled to the skies. Professor de Lagarde, of the University of Göttingen, and one of our best Oriental scholars, did not hesitate to declare, in 1885, that, looked at scientifically, Luther's translation of the Bible was a failure. And he passes the same judgment on the revised edition undertaken by a committee of German divines in our own day. Any attempt to bring Luther's translation to the test of modern philology and criticism, reveals unmistakably, that Luther made, not a faithful version but one serving his own purpose and theological system. That has ever been the opinion of Catholic divines, and the more philology advances, the more Luther's translation will lose ground.

---

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

The October number has a sympathetic article on Father Gasquet's "Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries"; also a clever article on "The Centenary of the French Catholics and the Conservatives," founded on the so-called "Cahiers of 1889." By the efforts of Count De Mun the Catholics of France have had collected *cahiers* of statements on the effects of the great Revolution, in the State, Society, Family, and Religion, and these *cahiers* were read before a great conservative meeting in Paris, June 23, 1889. Another article reviews the last volume of the "Monumenta Vaticana Historiam Regni Hungariae Illustrantia," which contains the "Liber Confraternitatis S. Spiritus de Urbe" (Budapestini 1889), with the entries relating to Hungarian pilgrims who became members of this confraternity, created by Innocent III. Dr. Baumgarten writes on the first part of the second volume of De Rossi's "Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romæ." To the November number I contributed an article on "Thureau-Dangin, La Monarchie de Juillet," vol. III.-V. (Paris, Plon 1886-1889), a classic work deserving of attentive perusal as written from a Catholic point of view. To English scholars the brilliant pages on the religious revival in France under the July Monarchy will be of special value.

---

3. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*

The number for September contains a biographical article on Father Pachtler, one of the first editors of the *Stimmen* and a well-known writer in prose and poetry. To him we are indebted for one of the best editions of the Vatican Council (*Acta et Decreta Herder* 1871), and for his great work "Monumenta paedagogica Germaniae. Ratio Studiorum Societatis Jesu," to which

even Protestant teachers attach great importance. Two articles are contributed on "Hadrian IV. and the Donation of Ireland," by Father Pfülf, who, unlike Cardinal Moran, F. Morris, and Professor Jungmann, apparently holds the alleged Bull of Hadrian IV. to be genuine. Lastly may be mentioned Father Baumgartner's article descriptive of the beauties of Christiania, which contains not a few pages of historical value, referring to past times when the Church held sway in Norway.

---

*4. Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (Innsbruck).*

In the October issue Father Herkenrath S.J. advocates the use of Latin in scientific theology, chiefly on the grounds of the Church's mind as manifested in recent provincial councils, next the more easy and appropriate expression of the sublime ideas of theology in a dead language with its stereotyped terminology; and lastly on the ground that theology is the common possession and good of Catholic divines throughout the world. Dr. Schmid writes on the category of "Quantitas."

---

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

*La Civiltà Cattolica*, 5 Ottobre, 1889.

**The Hebrew Plague.**—A curious account might be given, says the *Civiltà Cattolica*, of the circumstances connected with the publication of a work entitled *La Piaga Ebrea* by Dr. Giovanni de Stampa, if prudential considerations did not restrain the writer. Suffice it to say, that in a certain city containing many Jews, it was found impossible to get it accepted by any printing press; even the police interfered in the matter to prevent its publication. The enjoyment of full liberty seems a privilege at the present day reserved for the children of Israel. For instance, we see an infamous journal, *The Black Chronicle*, of which the director is a Hebrew, defaming Pope, Cardinals, Prelates and Clergy, with free licence, against all law; and here is a Christian who, through love of his country, wished to publish a work revealing the turpitudes of the Talmud and its followers, but is illegally deprived of the faculty of exercising his right. De Stampa's book, founded on the best authorities, is a small volume of thirty pages, and is intended as a serious caution to Jews and Christians, but especially to Christians. The Hebrew plague which now infests Europe consists, according to him, in the perilous influence which Judaism exercises on our social life, menacing its very existence. For the last century the Israelites have been attaining to the possession of exorbitant riches and power; and now, through the lying representations of the press, which is largely in their hands, they rail against the barbarous

fanaticism of Christians exercised against them in the disabilities and restrictions which in previous times were imposed upon them. De Stampa protests that neither national nor religious animosity has dictated his pages. He hates neither the persons of the Jews, nor their Semitic blood, but their vile works and the execrable maxims taught and inspired by their Talmud, which the mass of the Jewish nation has, since the coming of Christ, substituted for the law of Moses. "The Hebrew people," he says, "form a nation, not a religious sect." The Jew really never mingles with any other race; Crémieux, who held so influential a place in the French Ministry and was President of the "Israelite Universal Alliance," the secret guide of all the European Freemasonry, in the solemn discourse which he pronounced when invested with this high post, did not scruple to say: "We Hebrews are neither French, Italians, or Germans, but before all we have our Hebrew nationality, and this nationality we shall preserve until the time when to Emperors and Kings shall succeed the Messias and his kingdom, a kingdom which shall extend over the whole earth, and before whose banner all nations shall prostrate themselves; this time is not far distant, provided we international Hebrews labour for it with all the means in our power. Meanwhile we do not regard ourselves as the subjects of any nation." The Hebrews are therefore aliens and everywhere necessarily enemies, because they hold as a dogma that God has created the world for them and given it to them. It is no robbery, therefore, for a Jew to despoil anyone who is not a Jew also, because all he has is an unjust possession. It belongs to the Jews. This is pure Talmudism. "It is allowable," says the Talmud, "to cheat Christians," and it commends usury as a means of beggaring them. It is a serious matter to harbour such an enemy and worse still if the enemy has a consummate talent for assuming a mask suited to time and place. The author exclaims against the shame of having in Italy a Parliament which is like a synagogue. The population of the Peninsula is about thirty millions, of whom not more than 50,000 are Jews. "Half a Jew would therefore," he says, "be their proportionate representation at Monte Citorio," where, however, they swarm. Venice has the honour of being almost exclusively represented by them, and not in Parliament alone do they thus preponderate, they domineer in the courts of justice, the schools, and the press, which is almost entirely under their control, as well as the banks, the exchange, all the industries of the land, the whole circle, in short, of the material interests of the country. The Italian Hebrew correspondent of the *Judische Presse* of Berlin, writing on the 8th of August, 1887, jocularly observes: "In our Parliament you may hear a buzz of Jews; the Director of the official ministerial paper, the *Riforma* of Rome, is a Jew named Primo Levi; the highest posts of government are in the hands of our brethren;" and he goes on to say that "Depretis was a great friend to them and often attended their synagogue, and that his successor, Crispì, is their ardent

partizan." Thus the boasted liberty and independence of Italy with Rome for its capital, has all served to the profit of a handful of Asiatic strangers, to the incalculable detriment of the faith, morals, honour, and goods of the Italians. These Jews leagued with a band of apostate Freemasons, their accomplices and tools, compose that *legal* Italy which taxes, drains of its life-blood, teaches, corrupts, and contaminates the *real* Italy. Is it not a tremendous peril for Italians, while boasting of deliverance from a foreign yoke, to develop their social life within the grip of these harpies; to seek justice at tribunals where men preside who have the following rule in their written law: "When a Hebrew has recourse to justice against a Christian, the verdict must always be given in favour of the Hebrew;" to send their children to schools in which the teachers have this rule in their code: "The Hebrew ought to suggest to the Christian those principles which are afterwards to ruin him." No doubt there are exceptions. There are Jews whose sense of natural justice raises them above their creed, but such is the rule. Throughout Europe generally, Jews are allowed to blaspheme the faith of the Christians amongst whom they dwell, especially in the press, but not in the press only; witness a picture executed by a Leipsic Jew, and some six months ago exhibited in the Dresden gallery, representing our Lord as an assassin, and the twelve apostles as so many convicts from the galley, with this inscription, "The band of malefactors with the master Jesus." De Stampa does not wish to persecute or in any way harm the Jews; he would only suggest certain measures of prevention and restriction in self-defence.

16 Novembre, 1889.

**Reform of Sacred Music.**—Some very pertinent observations, made in this number on the subject of the Reform of Sacred Music in Italy, seem to be of general application. The late meeting at Soave, near Verona, which was largely attended, and the appointment of a permanent Committee to promote the progress and decorum of sacred music in Italy, are very encouraging signs. We may draw attention to some principles laid down at this meeting. Before all things, then, the reform of sacred music must have a strictly religious aim. This does not exclude its consideration under an artistic aspect, for sacred music does not, because sacred, cease therefore to be an art, and true art. Now, if artistic excellence is required in all music, it is most of all requisite where there is question of honouring God in His Temple, and moving the worshippers to recollection and devotion. We desire to offer to Him what is most perfect, relatively, that is, proportioned, to the means at our disposal. To act otherwise would be extravagant and absurd; and the same remark may be, and has been applied to the building of churches. Where means are very limited, we must be content that the House of God should be simple and decorous, grandeur being out of the question. But the artistic side

in Church music must always be secondary and subordinate to the religious. No art employed to serve the Catholic liturgy is so closely allied to it as is music. Look at the Mass and you will see that all its parts are transformable into music, and are so transformed when it is solemnly celebrated. Music is no foreign addition to it, it is an integral portion of divine worship. You cannot therefore touch sacred music without touching *ipso facto* the liturgy itself. The music of the Church ought, therefore, to have no other scope than that of the liturgy itself—to honour God and move the faithful to devotion. To consider it as solely or chiefly an object of art, as if the church were a concert room, or, worse still, to make it serve as an attraction to the profane world by adopting melodies of a theatrical style in order to suit its depraved taste, is surely a shameful desecration of the Holy Sacrifice. Another principle which was strongly insisted on at Soave, and which springs immediately from this conception of sacred music as part of the liturgy, was the full conformity it ought to have with the rubrical prescriptions in liturgical books regulating the worship at solemn functions, and with such as the Holy See may promulgate from time to time. A musical composition, then, may be a very master-piece of art, it may have the most powerful effects on its hearers, but if it does not agree with ecclesiastical rules it will never be a work of sacred art, and must be inexorably rejected. If sacred music is to be restored to its ancient splendour, the rule of the most perfect obedience to the authority of the Church must be laid down. At the very first sitting of the meeting at Soave all present gave their adhesion to this rule, and amidst the most enthusiastic applause it was decided that a telegram to that effect should be instantly sent to the Holy Father, Leo XIII., the supreme guardian of the Liturgy.

**The Chinese Rites.**—Our readers are aware of the prolonged controversy concerning the Chinese rites, which arose among the missionaries in that heathen empire. The present article examines what is the value of the judgment of the Holy See on this question, and asserts that it is purely dogmatic, the Pope having spoken as Head of the Church in a matter appertaining to the deposit of the faith. Whatever in these customs was infected with superstition and idolatry was condemned, while what was harmless and only associated with civil observances was to be tolerated. The same answer was given in subsequent parallel cases, to which the writer alludes in detail, and clearly infers that such customs were not simply bad, because forbidden, but forbidden because intrinsically bad, as being contrary to the first precept of the Decalogue. Hence, the first decision was final, and here he makes an important observation, grounded on the expressions used by the Holy Office in giving its reason for refusing to make any further reply to an application by the Vicar Apostolic of Tokien, in 1693, from which it appears that the Holy See had always answered according to truth, but without passing any judgment on the truth or falseness of

the exposition of facts made to it. The first is called *responsa veritatis*, the other *expositorium veritatis*. Concerning the veracity of the exposition of facts in the case of Chinese rites it had not then pronounced any decision, but it had declared the character of the facts as stated to be opposed to the Divine and natural law. Its sentence was therefore dogmatic and irreversible.

---

## *Notices of Books.*

---

*Our Christian Heritage.* By His Eminence CARDINAL GIBBONS.  
London : R. Washbourne. Baltimore : J. Murphy & Co. 1889.

WE have to announce the appearance of a very important addition to the literature of Christian Apologetics in Cardinal Gibbons' new work, "Our Christian Heritage." Although we claim that the life and thought of the world has still its centre of gravity in Europe, we all feel that America is, by its position and condition, the newer and broader field on which must be worked out the great social problems of the future. In view of that future, there is something pleasingly fitting and opportune in the fact that a great American Cardinal, with his eyes on the signs of the times, and his hand on the pulse of the people, has voiced the wisdom of the Church in the happiest manner, and fulfilled, with insight and foresight, his high duty of directing the American public to what all Christians must feel to be the safe and the sole solution. The method of the work is characteristic of the author. He does not speak from the lofty pinnacle of Catholic dogma, or even of distinctively Catholic philosophy, but descends to those lower steps which form the platform of what is known in this country as "common Christianity." Such a descent brings him within ear-shot of the nation, and within the sympathetic hearing of outsiders, and it goes without saying that he takes very good care that nothing of principle or position suffers in the least by his doing so. Describing the character of the work, the Cardinal says:—

This book is not polemical. It does not deal with the controversies that have agitated the Christian world since the religious convulsion of the sixteenth century. It does not, therefore, aim at vindicating the claims of the Catholic Church as superior to those of the separated branches of Christianity—a subject that has already been exhaustively treated.

It has nothing to say against any Christian denomination that still retains faith in at least the divine mission of Jesus Christ. On the contrary, I am glad to acknowledge that most of the topics discussed in this little volume have often found, and still find, able and zealous advocates in Protestant writers.

And far from despising or rejecting their support, I would gladly hold out to them the right-hand of fellowship so long as they unite with us in striking the foe. It is pleasant to be able to stand sometimes on the same platform with our old antagonists.

The object of the work, he further states, is not to influence the scoffer or avowed unbeliever, but rather to safeguard or strengthen the minds of the doubtful or perplexed, and to lead back to Christian belief those who have become, by distorting influences, estranged from the teachings of the gospel.

The book deals with the whole range of difficulties which commonly beset the mind unsettled by unbelief, and from the existence of God, the origin of man, the harmony of science and revelation, down to the social questions of labour, divorce, election, morality, all are treated with a painstaking earnestness and candour which cannot but win the gratitude and sympathy of the reader.

A fair sample of appositeness and elevation of thought is found in the Cardinal's views upon the Darwinian theory. He holds that the "missing link" is not to be sought downwards, between man the beast, but upwards, between man and God, and that it was precisely this link, which, broken by Adam, Christ came on earth to reforge and restore. Those who have before their recollection the sublime view of the Incarnation set forth in the work of St. Thomas Aquinas, will feel what sure and abundant ground the Cardinal has for his refined and exalted version of the theory. At the same time, readers of Professor Mivart may hold themselves free to believe that the restoration of the supernatural link in the one quarter does not necessarily preclude the existence of the natural link in the other, and they may even welcome both the Cardinal and the Professor as witnesses, each in his own section, to the completeness of the chain that binds the lowest and most remote particle of creation to the Throne of God.

Very often the author puts a great truth so happily that his very words—to borrow a phrase from his own side of the Atlantic—"catch on," and we feel as when the wand has been split by the shaft of the archer, that hardly or never will another do it better. The radical harmony of science and religion is a subject often associated in our minds with cumbrous sentences and painful efforts as laboured reconciliation. The following, we think, expresses the situation both easily and gracefully:—

Science and religion, like Martha and Mary, are sisters, because they are daughters of the same Father. They are both ministering to the same Lord, though in a different way. Science, like Martha, is busy about material things. Religion, like Mary, is kneeling at the feet of her Lord. . . .

'The God who dictated the Bible,' as Archbishop Ryan has happily said, 'is the God who wrote the illuminated manuscript of the skies.' You might as well expect that one ray of the sun would dim the light of another, as that any truth of revelation can be opposed to any truth of science. No truth of natural science can ever be opposed to any truth of revelation; nor can any truth of the natural order be at variance with any truth of the supernatural order. Truth differs from truth only as star differs from star—

each gives out the same pure light that reaches our vision across the expanse of the firmament.

The whole work bears throughout, the impress of the gifted mind and the apostolic heart of its author, and we cannot but believe that it has reserved for it an apostolic mission of guidance and light amongst the masses for whom it is intended. It is impossible to peruse its pages without feeling how much the author is present in his book, and to recognize that charm of luminous and Christ-like sympathy which wins its way both to the heart and to the convictions of the reader.

J. M.

---

*Une Colonie Féodale en Amérique. L'Acadie. (1604-1881.)* Par RAMEAU DE SAINT-PÈRE. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1889.

**T**HANKS to the genius of Longfellow, the pathetic story of the expulsion of the French colonists from Acadia is well known wherever the English language is spoken. Nearly thirty years before the Pilgrim Fathers set sail from our shores, a little band of Frenchmen settled in the peninsula now known as Nova Scotia. Though subject to the French Crown, they held little communication with the other colonies and the mother country. Hence they long preserved their primitive simplicity of manners. By the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) the country was ceded to England. For forty years the Acadians were practically unmolested by their new masters. But the presence of so many colonists of known sympathy with France, and, at the same time, Catholic, was looked upon as dangerous to the interests of the English colonists. Acadia, too, was one of the most fertile lands in the world. The old story of the wolf and the lamb was once more enacted.

M. Rameau de Saint-Père gives us not only the early history and "removal" of the Acadians, but also considerable information about their subsequent fate. He traces many of the families in the United States and France. It is sad to find that the descendants of those who settled in New York, deprived of the assistance of any French priests, gradually lost that faith for which their fathers had suffered so much. Lovers of Evangeline (and who is not one?) should be grateful to M. Rameau de Saint-Père for giving them in sober prose the proofs of the facts on which that beautiful poem is based.

T. B. S.

---

*The Origin of Human Reason. Being an Examination of Recent Hypotheses concerning it.* By ST. GEORGE MIVART, Ph.D., M.D., F.R.S. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1889.

**T**HE work here presented to the public by Dr. Mivart—so soon after the elaborate volume "On Truth"—is in the nature of a supplement to that book. Among those who have argued sophistically, but speciously, against the Catholic philosopher's great principle of

the essential difference between sense and intelligence, is Mr. G. J. Romanes. This gentleman's book, "Mental Evolution in Man," was published too late to be answered in the pages of the work "On Truth." Dr. Mivart has therefore taken it in hand in a separate publication, and devotes some 300 pp. to a keen analysis of its arguments, facts, and illustrations. The eight chapters are not very easy reading, mainly because the whole work is a running commentary on Mr. Romanes, whose name occurs so often, and in conjunction with such exasperating *non sequiturs*, that the most patient reader comes to regard him as a personal foe. His critic, himself, with all his philosophical patience in following the trail of a very long-winded "reasoner," admits that he expected better things from him.

We must confess [he says] to no small feeling of disappointment at finding we had no real novelty, no freshly discovered difficulty to contend with, but had mainly to occupy ourselves with the explanation of misunderstandings and the unravelling of curiously entangled conceptions. The real contention of the author is an old familiar one, and may be thus briefly put: "The infant *shows* no intellectual nature, therefore it *has* none. Savages are intellectually inferior to us in varying degrees, therefore their ancestors had no intellect at all." The argument in favour of these assertions really reposes almost exclusively on a supposed *a priori* probability, derived from that view of evolution which Mr. Romanes (following Mr. Darwin, Professor Haeckel, &c.) favours (p. 296).

Nothing could better describe the book's aim and motive. Mr. Romanes simply ignores the distinction between sense and reason—between the kingdom of operations and acquisitions dependent on the former, and the entirely distinct realm of the latter—and then reads his theory into all the "facts" which he and his friends have "observed," about monkeys, ants, collie-dogs, cockatoos, and babies. Dr. Mivart is obliged to devote a particularly tough chapter (Chap. II.) to putting Mr. Romanes right about mental states and processes; tough, not that he does not write with abundant clearness, but because all this talk about "percepts" "recepts," and "concepts," which has to be gone through with every man who in these days sets up as a philosopher, is not useful enough to demand the reader's serious attention; there is no amusement in learning a fresh grammar for every man who offers to converse with you. And it may here be added that Dr. Mivart himself adds to the horrors of the position by coining, with the best results, the terrible word "scept" —though, to do him justice, he only mentions it once or twice afterwards.

A great deal of the book is occupied with the discussion of the relations between Reason and Language. Mr. Romanes considers that we may take it as certain that animals have the *germ* of the sign-making faculty. This word "germ" is a snare to theorizers; we are not unfamiliar with books which state that animals have the "germ" even of ethical ideas. But Dr. Mivart points out (p. 128) that the term is ambiguous. Animals certainly not only possess the "germ" of *emotional* language, but have it fully matured and

developed. The question is, whether they have the minutest germ of an *intellectual* sign-making faculty. When a dog "points," we do not mean that it points as a man would. It stops, and the sportsman knows why. But the dog has no feeling of relation between the halt and its master's actions. Even if it expects something to happen, the feeling is only sense-memory; an intelligent "sign" requires abstract thought, as our author has abundantly proved in his book "*On Truth*." A most wonderful cockatoo story has been furnished by a correspondent of Mr. Romanes, in connection with the question of how far animals can use rational language. If the facts are as related, Dr. Mivart has good reason for saying that the bird possessed not only the "germ" of the sign-making faculty, but the very same intellectual powers which we possess, and "nothing but a series of accidents can have prevented one of Cockie's cousins from having discovered the law of gravitation or dictated a treatise like the ethics of Aristotle" (p. 136).

Mr. Romanes maintains that the human power of "thinking" is the exercise of introspective reflection which "consciousness" enables us to make (p. 182). Thus, if I think of a ladder as a means to get up to a window, I am only doing what a monkey can do; but if I say, "Dear me! I am thinking that a ladder, &c.," I am exercising my human prerogative. But every respectable philosopher, from Aristotle to Dr. McCosh, would tell him that there is no proof that the brute's conception of the relation between ladder and window is more than an awakened sense-impression acting on animal impulse; whereas, a man, long before he *reflects*, has the direct idea of the predicate "is" in the judgment, "the ladder is the way to reach the window."

All students of psychology will find this book a most useful manual, as the author takes up, comments upon, and correctly interprets an immense number of those stories of "animal intelligence" which the materialistic writers of the day are so fond of collecting and of using with perverse ingenuity. Incidentally, there is much interest of various kinds in these pages, as, for example, in the long account (p. 166 sqq.) of the deaf mute, Martha Obrecht; a detailed description of the means taken to educate a mass of flesh having no means of communication with other human beings, and without any power of expression save a cry combined with a motion of the body. Such an example as this is worth a thousand pages of such argument as Professor Huxley brings forward for the purpose of showing that the essential difference between man and brute is only language. The human deaf mute, sitting in darkness and isolation, speedily responds to skilful touch, and shows reason and intelligence; the brute, with every physical sense perfect, lives a hundred years and never gets beyond the emotional cry which it could utter from its birth.

---

*Cardinal Lavigerie and the African Slave Trade.* Edited by RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. London : Longmans. 1889.

THIS large and handsome volume, of nearly 400 pages, is divided into two parts. The first gives a biography of Cardinal Lavigerie, with a description of his administration in Algeria, and of his efforts for the organization of the Equatorial Missions. The second is an original and very well-written memoir on the present state of the Central African Slave Trade. We cannot be wrong in referring it mainly to the editor himself.

Born at Bayonne in 1825, Cardinal Lavigerie is now about sixty-four. In the earliest years of his priesthood he was Professor of Church History at the Sorbonne. But his missionary vocation soon asserted itself, and his first chance came when, in 1856, he accepted the direction of the Society for the Promotion of Christian Education in the East, and was sent, a few years later, to the Lebanon to carry the alms of France and to repair the desolation which the Druses had wrought on the Catholic tribes. He visited Beyrouth, Damascus, and the scenes of the massacres, distributing relief, organizing permanent institutions for the children, and diffusing comfort and confidence. For this he was publicly thanked by the Eastern Bishops, both Catholic and schismatic, and by the French Government. He was raised to the Episcopate as Bishop of Nancy in 1863, but was transferred, four years later, to the Archiepiscopal See of Algiers. His first Pastoral Letter shows the ardent and eager heart of the man. Algiers and Africa seem to have seized on his imagination. "Why hast thou fallen," he exclaims, "great and illustrious Church? Wherefore have the stones of thy sanctuaries been scattered and dispersed?" Later on he wrote :—

From every part of this huge continent, from the boundaries of the provinces France has annexed in the North to the English possessions at the Cape, one long wail of anguish has gone up for centuries; a cry wherein all the worst and keenest suffering our humanity is capable of feeling, meets and minglest; the cry of mothers, from whose arms the ruthless marauder snatches their little ones, to deliver them into life-long servitude, and who, like Rachel, weep for their children, and refuse to be comforted; the cry of peaceful, happy villagers, surprised by night in their sleep, who behold their dwellings reduced to ashes, all who resist put to death, and the remainder dragged away and driven to the market, where human beings are sold like cattle; the cry of interminable troops of miserable captives—men, women, and children—sinking from hunger, thirst, and despair, slowly expiring in the desert . . . . the cry of thousands of defenceless human beings, abandoned as a prey to the passions of their pitiless captors; all this, and much more, carried on daily through greed of gain, desire of revenge, or lust of conquest (p. 148).

Cardinal Lavigerie's work in Algeria itself is shown in the conversion and conciliation of the Arabs, Berbers, and Negroes, who form the indigenous population, in the multiplication of churches and schools, in the establishment of orphanages for the abandoned children of the native races, and in those agricultural "Colonies" which, with the help of the Trappists, he has pushed on even into the

Desert itself. He has had much trouble both from the French Government and from those hostile to French influence. Since the establishment of the Republic his allowances have been cut down, and his hands tied; but he goes on with his work, and, as all the world knows, has taken up, besides, the vast question of the Christianizing of Central Africa. At this he has been working since 1873. Pius IX., just before he died, blessed the "White Fathers"—a devoted Society founded by the Cardinal himself—and commissioned them for their perilous undertaking. Since then, two Apostolic Vicariates have been founded, the one on the great Victoria Nyanza, the queen of African inland seas, the other further south on Lake Tanganyika. There has been much persecution. Uganda has sent the first fruits of its martyrs to heaven; the White Fathers have lost eleven of their members by martyrdom, and more than fifty by hardship and exposure. Of these things we have detailed narratives in the book before us.

Cardinal Lavigerie is of opinion that, in order to Christianize the equatorial races, charity is not enough; there must be force. His idea is to enlist a body of volunteers who would hold stations, bar the slave routes, organize the defenceless natives, and, if necessary, fight the Arab marauders. The second part of the book describes in detail the horrors of the slave-stealing, the rapine and murder, the depopulation of the country, and the atrocities of the slave-march. The writer also discusses the influence and advance of Mahometanism, and shows what a fatal baseness it would be to allow that detestable and blighting fanaticism to possess Africa. As we have said, this part of the work is of very great and original interest. Perhaps something more might have been said of the actual state of the Protestant missions of the interior; without the knowledge of what these are doing, no adequate idea can be formed of the conditions of the missionary problem. The writer leaves the question of the suppression of slavery undecided. But all who wish to follow with intelligence the action which may be expected to follow from the Brussels Conference, and from the Conference which Cardinal Lavigerie himself hopes to hold before long, should possess himself of the information given in the pages of this seasonable book.

*The Biblical Illustrator.* By Rev. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A. St. Luke.  
Three Vols. London: James Nisbet & Co.

CERTAINLY Mr. Exell's Biblical compilations are one of the literary wonders of our age. Nearly three thousand pages are used to illustrate a Gospel which would hardly fill thirty. The majority of the illustrations are extracts from preachers and writers of the day. Liddon, Parker, Spurgeon, and Wilberforce are often laid under contribution. It goes without saying that the extracts are not all equally eloquent or apposite to the text. Still the collection of such an immense number is an evidence of the industry

of the editor and the enterprize of the publisher. We confess that we looked with some anxiety to see how certain crucial texts in the first chapter of St. Luke were treated. With the exception of a long passage from a sermon of the late Bishop Wilberforce against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, we found little that a Catholic could object to. On the contrary, we found many eloquent passages in praise of the Blessed Virgin which went beyond anything we could expect from a Protestant source. We quote one passage which, had it been found in St. Liguori or any Catholic manual, would have shocked Exeter Hall:—

No woman who ever lived on the face of the earth has been an object of such wonder, admiration, and worship as Mary, the Mother of our Lord. Around her poetry, painting, and music have raised clouds of ever-shifting colours, splendid as those around the setting sun. Exalted above earth, she has been shown to us as a goddess, yet a goddess of a type wholly new. She is not Venus, nor Minerva, nor Ceres, nor Vesta. No goddess of classic antiquity, or of any other mythology, at all resembles that ideal being whom Christian art and poetry presents to us in Mary. Neither is she like all of them united. She differs from them as Christian art differs from classical, wholly and entirely. Other goddesses have been worshipped for beauty, for grace, for wisdom, for power. Mary has been the goddess of poverty and sorrow, of pity and mercy, and as suffering is about the only certain thing in human destiny, she has numbered her adorers in every land, and climate, and nation. In Mary womanhood, in its highest and tenderest development of the mother, is the object of worship. Motherhood, with its large capacities of sorrow with the memory of bitter sufferings, with sympathies large enough to embrace every anguish of humanity! Such an object of veneration has inconceivable power.—H. B. STOWE.

*Orelli's Prophecies of Jeremias.* Translated by Rev. J. S. BANKS.  
Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

DR. ORELLI'S commentaries on the Prophecies are well known to Biblical students. In translating them into English, Mr. Banks has undertaken a useful labour, and the portion he has just completed will prove of great service to students unacquainted with German. Dr. Orelli defends the genuineness and authenticity of the Prophecies of Jeremias as a whole; "at most," he says, "certain sections may be distinguished as of another class." The prophet he considers to have finished the volume in Egypt. In regard to the Lamentations mentioned in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, he takes them, as seems natural, to be distinct from those usually called after Jeremias; whilst he thinks we have good grounds for attributing these latter to the prophet whose name they bear. Kueper and others, he says, have convincingly shown "the critical inferiority and utter untrustworthiness of the LXX. as regards this book." He therefore, of course, supports the critical superiority of the Masoretic text. Still he allows that the Greek is superior to the Masoretic in particular details, "so that it may be used at least in certain passages for restoring the original text."

*A New Commentary on Genesis.* By FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D., Leipzig. Translated by SOPHIA TAYLOR. Two Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1889.

THIS last addition to Messrs. Clark's foreign Library has an especial value to Biblical students. Some twenty years have gone by since Dr. Delitzsch wrote his first Commentary on Genesis. During this time destructive criticism has been busy with the Pentateuch, breaking it up into many fragments, pieced together after the Exile, and calling in question the Mosaic authorship of even the smallest particle. It will then be particularly interesting to observe what attitude the veteran commentator assumes in regard to modern theories. From his learned Introduction we gather that Dr. Delitzsch confines his defence of the Mosaic authorship to what is called the Book of the Covenant (*Exod. xix. to xxv.*). For other parts of the Pentateuch he contents himself with claiming a varied but pre-exilian authorship. He distinguishes the Thorah, strictly so called, from the Pentateuch, which, he says:—

Like other historical books of the Bible, is composed from documentary sources of various dates and different kinds, which critical analysis is able to recognize and distinguish from each other with more or less certainty" (p. 53).

As a commentator Dr. Delitzsch has a special advantage. Though a "Hebrew of Hebrews," yet he is a Christian by conviction, and therefore a firm believer in the Inspiration of the Scriptures. He says that he is no believer in the "Religion of the times of Darwin." In his view, if Lyellism and Darwinism are true, then Christianity is false. It will not then be expected that in his comments on Genesis he would give himself much trouble in attempting to harmonize science and Scripture. "For," he says, "the ground on which our faith is anchored is independent of scientific evidence." We have only to add that this new Commentary on Genesis is both well translated and well edited.

*The Credentials of the Catholic Church.* By the Rev. J. B. BAGSHAWE. Fifth Thousand. London: R. Washbourne. 1889.

WE are very glad to see this, a cheap (1s.) edition of an excellent book, of which we have on its first appearance expressed our high opinion. It may help to recommend the volume for the purposes of distribution, &c., if we point out an admirable feature in Dr. Bagshawe's treatment of his subject. Of his abundant knowledge and ability we need not speak, but will note that the zeal which has led him to write this and its companion volume, "The Threshold of the Catholic Church," is, admirably, a zeal with charity for those it seeks to instruct. There is no harshness of either expression or tone throughout, but a studied consideration of other peoples very natural feelings. "Clever things and hard hits," the author says,

are too frequent in controversy, and not "much good comes of them :" and, let us add, they are easier to make than patient replies and adequate explanations. These sentences of the Preface deserve to be quoted :—

If you want a man to see an object through a telescope, you do not quarrel with him because he cannot make it out. You try to find out what it is that prevents him from seeing ; you arrange the focus of your glass to suit his sight, you show him in which direction to look, and so forth. With a little patience you can generally get him to see *something*. He may not be able, at last, to see all the details you would like to show him, but at any rate he sees that there *is* a prospect, and has some idea what it is like.

My object, then, in writing, is not to say hard things of any one, but to set my glass, if I may say so, to suit my fellow-countrymen, so that as many as possible may be able to see through it. If I cannot get them to see all the glories and beauties of the Catholic Church as I do, I hope, at any rate, that I may be able to convince them that there *is* something to be seen.

I have taken for my subject the Authority of the Church because it seems such a pity that people should go on arguing about secondary points, leaving the primary questions unsettled. If we were once agreed about the main question, the others would very soon settle themselves ; whereas, as I have tried to show, arguments on secondary points are seldom satisfactory or conclusive.

I have called my book the " Credentials " because it treats of the *grounds*, and *proofs*, and *tokens*, which the Church exhibits to the world to establish her claim to be considered an ambassador from God.

The author leads up to his chief subject, the " Marks " of Christ's Church, by a series of consecutive chapters, treating of the confusions, &c., of Private Judgment, showing that there is no alternative between private judgment and the Church's " Authority," and on the nature of a " Church " (a valuable chapter dealing with the " Branch " and " Family " theories), with finally, a no less useful chapter on the nature of Infallibility. There is an Appendix on the meaning and advantages of the Catholic use of ritual in public worship.

*The Armourer of Solingen, and Wrongfully Accused.* By WILHELM HERCHENBACH. Translated from the German by H. J. GILL, M.A. With Eight Illustrations. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1890.

TWO straightforward and excellent tales, well adapted for the young, and not to be despised by their elders. The atmosphere of faith which prevails, both in the adventurous mediæval story, and in the more modern narrative, renders the volume a most suitable addition to the library of a Catholic household ; yet there is nothing obtrusively religious in either. Mr. Gill translates with great freedom and elegance : if this is his first appearance in the field of literature, his future performances will be looked for with interest.

## THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Stories of the Seven Sacraments.* By LOUISA EMILY DOBRÉE. Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7.
2. *Biographical Series.* Father Olivaint (1816-71), condensed from the French of PÈRE LE CLAIR; Venerable Julie Billiart, Foundress of the Congregation of the Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur; Saint Francis Xavier (1506-1552).
3. *Science and Scientists.* Papers on Natural History. By the Rev. JOHN GERARD, S.J. No. I. Mr. Grant Allen's Botanical Fables. No. II. Who painted the Flowers? No. III. Some Wayside Problems.
4. *The Penny Library of Catholic Tales.* No. XII. A Death-Bed Repentance. By Lady HERBERT. And Four other Tales. London: C.T.S. 1889.

1. MISS DOBREE'S later instalments of stories of the Sacraments are not inferior in any way to the three we praised last quarter. We have now "Ted's Medal," a story of Penance, "Sylvia's Lesson" (Extreme Unction), "Two Wishes" (Holy Orders), and "Regained" (Matrimony). Many will think the last the best; but they are all of well-sustained interest.

2. The titles of the most recent issues of the penny biographical series will sufficiently explain the contents. Father Olivaint, it may be mentioned, was one of the Jesuit Fathers of Paris, shot by the Commune of 1871. He was a learned and a holy man, who, in his early years, had intended to be a Dominican, and was drawn to the Society of Jesus apparently by the desire to suffer. This little account of his career is very interesting.

3. These natural history papers are a new feature of C.T.S. enterprise, and a happy variation of good work. Father Gerard writes in a very graphic, agreeable style, with such abundant illustration from his own observations as to be quite attractive. He attacks the modern propensity of scientific writers for theories and for a mechanical explanation of the universe. Many of us have read the explanation given by Sir John Lubbock and others of how the "Cuckoo-pint" (*arum maculatum*) is fertilized by the ingenious imprisonment within its calyx of the flies which visit it:—a number of thread-like stalks, ranged around the entrance, act as a *chevaux de frise*, and keep in the flies, which they bent to admit, until later, fertilization being effected, the threads wither and the flies escape. This is a specimen of how Father Gerard shows up the "fable":—

This is a very pretty and interesting history; and to look at the picture of the Arum which Sir J. Lubbock engraves we should judge it to be very probable. But flowers do not always grow in the fields as they are drawn in books, and if the observer will go out for himself, and find an Arum, and slice it open with his penknife, he will probably find that there is nothing whatever in the *chevaux de frise* to hinder any fly from walking out when

he likes. The threads are by no means thick set, they twist about and do not run straight, and there is generally plenty of room between their extremities and some portion of the walls. Flies there are generally in plenty, little black flies, so small that it would seem to be a matter of no consequence which way the spikes point, for they could pass between them. The real obstacle to egress is a condition which looks very much like being drunk and incapable. They lie, often many deep, at the bottom, some without any sign of life, many in a limp and languid condition, much like rioters who have broken into a wine-vault. Whether, when they come forth from their confinement, the fresh air, to which they have been so long unaccustomed, gives them strength and energy to hunt up another Arum before they get rid of their coat of pollen—and Arums do not generally grow very near one another—is a question requiring a great deal of very close and clever observation for its solution\* ("Botanical Fables," p. 9).

4. Nothing need be said to recommend this fresh volume of Tales. Besides the title-story, there are two others by Lady Herbert—that of "The Pious Convict" being an excellent story of considerable pathos. "Daddy Mike," by Lindsay Duncan, is the story of a touching incident in the struggle between an Irish tenant and the "Agent;" and the remaining tale, "Only a Little Boy," is a Christmas incident in the Tyrol, from the pen of the Baroness Pauline von Hügel.

---

*Hunolt's Sermons.* Vols. V. and VI. *The Penitent Christian.* Seventy-six Sermons on Penance, &c. By the Rev. Father FRANCIS HUNOLT, S.J. Translated by the Rev. J. ALLEN, D.D. 2 vols. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1889.

*Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Festivals.* By Rev. JULIUS POTTGEISSER, S.J. Rendered from the German by Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 2 vols. New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers. 1890.

IT is nearly four years (July, 1886) since we noticed the first two volumes of this translation of Hunolt's Sermons. What we then said as to the solidity of the matter they offer for the preacher's choice, the appropriateness of the abundant Scripture and Patristic texts, may be repeated here of the two latest volumes, as also may a recognition of the general excellence of the translator's work. Bishop Rickards warmly eulogized and recommended the Sermons in his Introduction to the first volumes, and he gives his *Imprimatur* to the present ones.

Father Pottgeisser's sermons are briefer (which is not mentioned as a fault; Hunolt's are too long for modern practice), and they are simpler in construction, but are marked by earnestness, and contain much practical, if somewhat obvious, moralizing. The first volume contains sermons for the Sundays, and the second for Festivals—these latter strike us as being the better, generally.

---

\* Since writing the above in 1882, I have convinced myself that the Arum kills the flies which visit it, and absorbs their more succulent portions into its own substance. [Father Gerard's note.]

*The Foundation of the Creed.* By HARVEY GOODWIN, D.C.L., Lord Bishop of Carlisle. London : John Murray. 1889.

A WORK which is professedly put forth as a nineteenth century substitute for, or supplement to, Bishop Pearson "On the Creed," should be learned and orthodox. Bishop Goodwin's performance shows, as well as anything can show, the progress of Anglicanism along the down-grade since the seventeenth century. Bishop Pearson wrote against the atheist, the Jew, and the heretic of the early Church ; Bishop Goodwin has to prop up and put patches on a dilapidated faith which is all that is left to the "Churchmen" of modern times.

The hesitating believer who had recourse to Bishop Goodwin's handsome volume would find the Apostles' Creed set forth with much orthodox explanation, with plain and plausible commentary, and with a certain grasp of Christian doctrine as a whole. He would rise from its perusal with a clear view of a great system of Divine activity centred in the Incarnation. He would feel that, to a believer in an Almighty Creator, the popular "difficulties" about the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Judgment, and the Forgiveness of Sins, were of very minor importance. Bishop Goodwin has a genuine hold on the Unity and Trinity of God, the Divinity and Humanity of our Lord, and the Divine Energy of the Holy Ghost. The book therefore will do good, no doubt, in the sphere for which it is intended ; that is, it will benefit those unfortunate Christians who (as he says) are anxious to combine belief in mystery and reverence for antiquity with that power of "appealing to reason," which is the legacy of the Blessed Reformation. No one acknowledges more readily than Catholics that it is most useful and necessary to disarm rational objections against the mysteries of the Faith. Cardinal Gibbons has, to a large extent, done this work in his recently published "Our Christian Heritage." Father Lacordaire and Cardinal Newman have also devoted many splendid pages to a similar purpose.

What there is missing in the "apologetics" of the Anglican Bishop is the idea that there exists in the Church of the present day any power of speech. The Church which formed the Creeds must have died in its early youth ; or else there would still be an authority to settle whether, for instance, there is a real presence in the eucharistic elements, or a sacrament of penance, or "Limbo," or purgatory. The learned Bishop goes laboriously on, with his "it may be," and "we may well believe," and "surely it cannot be wrong," until one begins to feel that the Christian Faith is to an Anglican rather an "affair of the laboratory," as Mr. A. J. Balfour would call it, than a system for saying your prayers by. This parsonic and namby-pamby "moderation" is all very well for an Anglican sermon, but it will not meet the wants of palpitating human hearts. Such a religion as is here preached could never be popular ; it could only be respectable. Yet Bishop Goodwin

ventures to predict that the Church of England is to be the principal preacher of the Gospel of the future!

The book is calmly written, but every now and then there is the inevitable "gird" at our "Roman brethren." He talks, among other things, of modern developments (in France), of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and he shows how much he knows about them by alluding to the appearance of Our Lady "to two children at Lourdes" (p. 184), evidently confusing Lourdes with La Salette.

As to numerous matters, more or less closely connected with the Faith, he writes as one who has read neither the Fathers nor the Theologians; this, of course, was to be expected. But the book is an honest attempt, as far as one can see, to promote the cause of God and of supernatural religion.

---

*Sermons.* By H. P. LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of St. Paul's. Second Edition. *Sermons.* By the Ven. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

THESE two volumes compose the first and third of "The Contemporary Pulpit Library." The sermons in the first volume, by Dr. Liddon, are, as might be expected, distinguished by thoughtfulness and scholarship. They will prove, however, to many readers disappointing—what the living voice, the glancing eye, and the attractive presence of the preacher may have done to give power and effect to them, we do not know. They read, however, dry and didactic, and are wanting in sympathy and warmth.

Dr. Farrar's sermons are marked by the preacher's usual characteristics: rapidity of thought, vehemence and flow of language. There is a good deal of strong, plain practical speaking in some of them. The following in the mouth of a preacher who is emphatically Protestant in spirit and principle, is noteworthy, and has provoked much Protestant remark and criticism. It is from the sermon on "The Signs of the Times."

I cannot share, I grieve to say, in these jubilations about our progress, where, in a city of four millions, three millions and more on one Sunday are in no place of worship. I think the Church should rather be sitting and weeping in dust and ashes than glorifying herself about her own activity. New times want new methods and new men, and, if we do not adopt new methods and find new men, who really are men, we shall die of our own impotent respectability. It is not enough for us only to edify, or to strive to edify, the faithful few, when so little is being done which reaches the lost many. We need a new order of clergy altogether, side by side with, and nobler than ourselves—an order that will live poor and unmarried in the very midst of the poor, as poorly as they live, giving up, as the Apostles did, everything for Christ; men who shall take the simple Gospel in their hands, and nothing else; men who are conspicuous for their manliness, their humility, their self-sacrifice, and who by their whole lives will pour silent contempt on gold (p. 63-4).

This is bold and outspoken preaching for a Protestant Arch-

deacon, and we must admire it. The orator ought to have gone a little farther, and completed his ideal, and said : In fact, we need the missionary monks and religious of the Catholic Church with their vows, their poverty, chastity, and obedience.

However we may admire the eloquent outspokenness of Dr. Farrar, and his courage in exalting Catholic Saints like St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Thomas Aquinas, and others, we cannot but note very many things in these Protestant sermons which grate upon Catholic feeling.

---

*Before Our Lord Came. An Old Testament History for Young Children.* By Lady AMABEL KERR. London : Burns & Oates. New York : Catholic Publication Society Co.

WITHIN the space of less than two hundred pages Lady Amabel Kerr cleverly gives a narrative of the Old Testament story, which young children will be able to understand, and which many older people will find quite readable. The value of such a book for the nursery needs not to be pointed out. The narrative is broken into lessons on some one person or event, and it is easy to see how a parent or teacher may use these little stories of God's preparation of the world for Our Lord's coming as a means of education in the very fullest and best sense. The book deserves to become a recognized necessity in a young household ; certainly the children will be attracted by its simply told wonders, and enjoy the numerous illustrative pictures.

---

*Campion. A Tragedy in a Prologue and Four Acts.* By the Rev. G. TOUGHAYE, S.J. Translated into English Blank Verse by JAMES GILLOW MORGAN. London : Burns & Oates. 1889.

THE author has woven the Conversion and Martyrdom of Blessed Edmund Campion into dramatic form with considerable stage effect, making, however, with pardonable license, some slight transpositions of historical events. The play may be read with much interest, and will acceptably add to the acting repertory of our colleges and schools. The translation is very literal, and is not unworthy of the distinguished author's reputation.

---

*Christmas Legends.* Translated from the German. By O. S. B. London : R. Washbourne. 1890.

THE seven Legends in this little volume—which is a worthy addition to Mr. Washbourne's excellent "Catholic Premium Book Library"—are all worth reading ; boys and girls will alike be pleased with them. Some of them are Legends in the usual

sense of the word, but one, "A Christmas Eve on Mount St. Gothard," is really a modern—and a very good—story and description of the famous Hospice and dogs, while another, "The Twelfth; or, the Missing One," is a thrilling incident in the French Revolution well told.

---

*Marie Stuart, la Reine Martyre.* Par V. CANET. Lille : Desclée, de Brouwer et Cie. 1888.

THIS volume, of 220 pages, is a brief life of Mary, Queen of Scots, addressed chiefly to French readers. The author contents himself with simply narrating facts in clear, good French style. But anything like critical investigation of the great English and German works on Scotland and Queen Mary is not attempted. This is to be regretted, of course; and yet we may recommend M. Canet's well-written book as a clever narration of facts and a correct appreciation of the leading personages of the narrative. Numerous beautiful woodcuts add to the attractiveness of the book.

BELLESHEIM

---

*Island und die Färöer.* Von ALEXANDER BAUMGARTNER, S.J. Freiburg: Herder. 1889.

FATHER BAUMGARTNER follows up his "Reisebilder aus Schottland" with a book on Iceland and the Faroes. It has already been welcomed by the general public not less than by Catholic Germany. It is not simply a record of the author's journey in company with Father von Geyr and Count Wolfegg, in 1883, to Iceland, but it also describes the country, its inhabitants and customs, as seen by a philosopher, theologian and essayist,—for such our author eminently is. He gives us the history of the Church, and we become acquainted with the civil institutions of Iceland, and, what is still more noteworthy, with its literature. This, the literary side of the work, is of great and permanent value, by reason of the clever versions of the "Solar God," and a great number of other Danish and Icelandic poems. No less than forty-three maps and illustrations add to the value of this excellent book.

BELLESHEIM.

---

*Philip's Restitution.* By CHRISTIAN REED. Dublin : H. M. Gill & Sons. 1890.

A HIGH-TONED Catholic story, the scene of which is laid in "Riverport," a town situated, we are told, on "the borders of the prosperous South-West and West," in the United States. The characters are natural and sufficiently interesting, the story well told, and the moral not formulated, but very clear. It is handsomely got up, and beautifully printed.

*The Supremacy of the Apostolic See in the Church.* By the Very Rev. FRANZ HETTINGER. Translated from the German. With Preface by the Most Rev. GEORGE PORTER, S.J., Archbishop of Bombay. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publishing Society.

THIS small book is a part of Dr. Hettinger's "Apologie des Christenthums," which (we are glad to learn) is being translated in its entirety into English. In the present volume we have two lectures of the learned Professor, the eighteenth and nineteenth. We cannot say too much of the learning, clearness and cogency of this treatise. The author shows himself profoundly acquainted with the whole nature and bearing of his subject. The notes, which are thrown together at the end of the book, are a clear indication of the extensive erudition of the writer. And though the book is so full and satisfactory in its learning, it is not dry or heavy: it may, indeed, be said to be a popular treatise, whilst in no way superficial. The subject dealt with is of great actual interest and importance, and we could not recommend a book which treats of it with more conciseness and accuracy.

The translation is on the whole good: but there are some small errors to be corrected, such as Cyrus for Cyrrhus (p. 85), Veronius for Veron (p. 106), Miletus for Milevis (pp. 74 and 81), and several times we have the great edition of the Councils put down to Labbé, instead of Labbe.

---

*Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church.* By Professor G. T. STOKES, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

PROFESSOR STOKES'S second volume deals with Irish history from the Norman Conquest until the Reformation. We have read it with care. Nay, more,—having noted in the Preface that "a stern censor," who had pronounced the Professor's first volume, "Ireland and the Celtic Church," flippant, is answered by the Professor, that, "there are some circles where obscurity is mistaken for profound thought and pedantic dulness for surpassing learning," we turned back and re-read "Ireland and the Celtic Church." Professor Stokes says he is paid to lecture on Church history at Trinity College, Dublin, but that nobody is bound to listen to him. He must draw his audience. We do not, indeed, blame the lecturer for trying to "draw" an audience; but, surely, some tactics are hardly admissible even on that plea. One may readily pardon a good deal of by-play in the delivery of a lecture which would be altogether inadmissible in a published volume. A Professor should remember that there is a dignity which cannot be laid aside without injury to the reputation of a University, or to the treatment of the subject in hand. However, the Professor perhaps knew his audience best, as also what is to the credit of Trinity. As for the matter of the Lectures, they really contain a good deal of history, and a good deal that is not history at all. So long as Dr. Stokes keeps to history he

is a profitable friend ; but when he begins to moralize and discover parallels in modern times he is puerile. For example, we are told why Giraldus Cambrensis failed in Rome—English influence was against him ; and then the Professor adds :—

In fact, I believe that Irish Roman Catholics complain that English influence, even though hostile to the Pope from a religious point of view, is much more potent in Papal court circles than that of the more faithful Irish, and that an English noble is a much more acceptable personage to a Roman Cardinal than a Bishop from Connaught or Munster (p. 66).

Again :—

The winter of 1168-1169 passed as winters usually passed in Ireland in those times. The ancient Irish inverted the order of their descendants. The long nights are famous in the annals of modern Irish disturbances for many a sad tale of assassination and bloodshed. The long nights and the short days and the tempestuous weather in ancient times gave the inhabitants of the land their only season of peace (p. 66).

Unfortunately, the Professor must have a bad memory—a terrible weakness when a historian has a thesis to back up through thick and thin—for, later on, having another cause to serve, he tells us that Irish winters passed as usual—"eating, drinking, and fighting" (p. 92), when not even the long nights, the short days, and the weather kept them quiet. Again, speaking of the murder of De Lacy at Durrow (1186), he does not lose his chance of telling us how the murderer "escaped all pursuit, and, like many a similar offender since, was hailed as a champion of independence by his countrymen." Or, again, describing the country between Dublin and Glendalough, where he wants to say that the country is impassable, he tells us that, "if you quit the road for five minutes, the most active and athletic undergraduate, marching, with no heavier luggage than a tooth-brush and a clean collar" (p. 112), &c., would soon find himself jumping to save himself from pits of bottomless mud. Of course the students might enjoy all this ; but we seriously ask, is it dignified ? is it a style of treatment for a grave and learned topic ?

But, further, the Professor fails in the little matter of accuracy, not only in details, but in such grave matters of Church discipline and faith as celibacy of the Clergy and Papal Supremacy. As to mistakes he shows little mercy to others. He comes down, and rightly too, on Mr. Wright, who edited "Giraldus Cambrensis," for a "laughable" blunder in confounding Kinsale in Cork with Kinsellagh, a tribal division in Wexford. He translated Kinsale, "by the magic witchery of his pen," says the Professor, "fifty or sixty miles east." And now comes "another blunder, equally gross and stupid," which the Professor duly pillories, and lets his vengeance fall on Mr. Riley, B.L., who edited Hoveden for Bohn's Library, telling us of the "crass blunders perpetrated by men who undertake to edit chronicles and history dealing with Irish matters, though themselves utterly devoid of all knowledge of either Irish history or Irish geography" (p. 131). Mr. Riley, unfortunately,

confounded Crook (where Henry II. landed) with Cork. But our Professor himself commits a blunder that will probably equal either of these, and that not an antiquarian one, but as to the *locale* of an event happening in 1831. We refer to page 86, where he, by the "magic witchery of his pen," removes Carrickshock from the Co. Kilkenny into Co. Carlow.

The men of this generation [and in particular the Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Dublin University] know nothing of the battle of Carrickshock, when a large body of police, horse and foot, was annihilated in the very same neighbourhood [about which the Professor is at sea] as Dermot McMorrough, was now invading. It was the terrible time of the tithe agitation, the latter part of the year 1831, when a body of police were enticed into a woody defile [it is really a stone-wall country for miles around about from Ballyhaie to Hugginstown, and a hungry stone-wall country, too], in the county Carlow and almost completely destroyed, &c. (p. 86).

Of course there was no necessity whatever of introducing the battle of Carrickshock into a course of lectures on Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church; but the Professor must tell us everything he knows,—and a good many things he evidently does not know. Again, as an example of his accuracy, he gives us the history of the infamous Wimund, and tells us that he was brought up in Furness Abbey (p. 202), when he was only professed there, as he had been previously a lay brother at Seez, in Normandy. He tells us that the Irish accepted the Royal Supremacy (pp. 192, 251, note, *et passim*). Let us see. The Lateran Council assembled in 1179. Laurence of Dublin, Catholicus of Tuam, and five or six other Irish bishops were there. Did these believe in Royal Supremacy? They subscribed to the Canons, and the first Canon (Gulielmi Newburg Lib. iii. cap. 3) makes provision for the election of the Pope: "Whoever has two-thirds of the votes" must be received by the *Universal Church*. Difficulties may arise with Bishops' elections, but that is not a serious difficulty; and here comes the point—"For whatever doubt may arise among them, it may be finally settled by the judgment of THE SUPERIOR; but in the Roman Church and Court a special case exists, *since recourse cannot be had to any Superior*." Because the Roman See has no superior, being *supreme*. The same Council (Can. xxv. Gul. Newburg) (continuation of preceding Canon according to Labbe) throws some light on the discipline of celibacy subscribed by Irish Archbishops and Bishops:—(we give it here because the Professor tells us that the Irish clergy married and gave in marriage just as do the Protestant clergy of the present day)—"Clerks in Holy Orders who retain in their houses such females as labour under the reproach of incontinence, shall cast them out and live chastely, or be deprived of their ecclesiastical benefice." As for the issue of the *congé d'éclire*, it certainly did not mean Royal Supremacy. How often, again and again, has the Pope during those times quashed the election which took place on receipt of the Royal license, and appointed a different Bishop by

Papal Provision Bulls? We can recall where a fine of £100 was imposed upon English monks by one of the English kings because they did not await the issue of the Royal license. The Pope condemned the election as *informal*, simply because the license was *not* issued, and then appointed the very same man without any license whatever, but simply by means of a Bull of Provision.

We had hoped, from the title of Professor Stokes's volume, that some of the interesting problems of Church and State during the period traversed would be dealt with. They are the only interesting questions of this period. But light on important questions is not to be expected from Professor Stokes; he has not read enough for that—Trinity College Library is his boundary. Even the Vatican is poor in historical wealth in his eyes. He completely leaves all the English and Anglo-Norman historians out in the cold in these lectures, and does not seem to think that there are any besides Hoveden and Newburg (William of). We hope that, in the next volume, which the Professor promises, he will eschew trivialities, give ample references to every document he consults, and, whenever possible, let them be original.

J. S.

*Jérusalem : son Histoire, sa description, ses Etablissements religieux.*  
Par VICTOR GUÉRIN. Paris: E. Plon, Nourrit & Cie. 1889.

THE author of this volume is a recognized authority on the subject of the Holy Land. He is familiarly acquainted with the places and scenes he describes, and with the arguments and literature of its archaeologists and explorers: his first visit to the land he so enthusiastically loves for its sacred associations was made more than 30 years ago, and since that he has been entrusted by the French Government with three special missions to Palestine, and has published as a result thereof in seven volumes his "Description géographique, historique et archéologique de la Palestine" (Paris: Challamel ainé), which is now a standard work. He writes also both well and intelligently, and with genuine Catholic reverence for the earthly home of the Incarnate Saviour. It will be seen, therefore, that one may rightly expect from his pen, not the transient impressions of a glib writer, but trustworthy observation; and this, in fact, is the character of M. Victor Guérin's volumes. His latest publication is of the same kind. In an octavo volume of five hundred pages, he traces first the history of the Holy City from pre-Davidic times downwards to our own. The chapters which cover the period from S. Helena, through the Frankish Kingdom, and Turkish rule, are attractive reading; but the second part of the book, devoted to a description of the city at various periods, and of the Holy Places within it, is of considerably greater interest to the English Catholic reader. M. Guérin defends the authenticity of the chief sites, as *e.g.*, of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre, and as he knows familiarly not the ground only but history and his Bible, he is no puny defender of the traditional identifications. The

third part of the volume contains a description of the existing religious establishments and works in the Holy City, and will be the most completely new information to most readers. Of course, the Franciscan Fathers, whose mission to the Holy Land dates back to the thirteenth century, and who have been the constituted custodians of the Holy Places since the decree of Propaganda of 1627, have a chapter to themselves. Perhaps not a few of us who know all about the English and German efforts to establish their united Protestant Bishopric of Jerusalem, do not know that one of the earliest acts of Pius IX. was to re-establish after centuries of interruption the ancient Latin patriarchate of Jerusalem. The decree which formally re-established it was dated July 23, 1847, and the first patriarch was Mgr. Valerga, an accomplished and zealous prelate, the twenty-five years of whose reign M. Guérin becomingly describes as "les vingt-cinq années de son second et illustre patriarcat." For some details of the wonderful results which this zealous prelate achieved we must necessarily refer the reader to M. Guérin's pages. In 1873 succeeded the second patriarch, Mgr. Bracco, who after a similarly zealous and glorious career, died at Jerusalem in June of last year. Of the numerous Orders of men and women of whose works, residences, &c., M. Guérin gives so detailed and graphic an account—Christian Brothers, Dominican Fathers, Sisters of Charity, &c., &c.—we cannot here even enumerate the names. The author's last visit to the Holy City was made as late as 1889, and was used in the interest of these pages to bring all the statistics and information up to date. As a last word in praise of a valuable book, we may mention the excellent large plan of the city carefully made by the author himself from his own observation and the best recent surveys.

---

*History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, from the Introduction of Christianity to the present day. By ALPHONS BELLESHEIM, D.D. Translated with Notes and additions by D. OSWALD HUNTER BLAIR, O.S.B. In Four Volumes. Vol. III. 1560–1625. Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood & Sons. 1889.

IT is a pleasure to chronicle the appearance of the third volume of Dom Hunter Blair's excellent translation of Canon Bellesheim's work. The volume carries the story of Catholic affairs in Scotland, from Queen Mary's return from France, to the death of James VI., sixty-five mournful years for every Catholic interest in the kingdom. It makes one's heart heavy to read the record of blatant fanaticism rampant, of ineffectual struggle against the licentiousness of the age, of might overwhelming right. There is a pathetic contrast, in the opening of this volume and its close, between the frontispiece map, showing the state of the Catholic Church in Scotland in 1550, with its dioceses and deaneries, and sees, monasteries and nunneries, plenti-

fully dotted over all the south and east, and the two last pages of narrative, where we see the few remaining Catholics of Scotland, without even a bishop of their own, memorializing the Holy See against being placed under the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of England. Canon Bellesheim's statements are founded on a document which has long been known in Tierney's "Dodd," but his words may be quoted :—

The memorialists . . . laid great stress on the ancient enmity between the two nations, and the disastrous consequences that had followed every attempt to subject their Church to the jurisdiction of English prelates. They pointed out that the English had no acquaintance with the affairs of Scotland, and that the necessity of recurring to a bishop in England, in reserved cases and similar matters, would lead to endless difficulties and annoyances. To the argument that a bishop was necessary in order to confer the sacraments of confirmation and orders, they rejoined that the proper place for their clergy to be ordained was, for many reasons, the seminaries or monasteries where they had been educated; and that, as for confirmation, they had hitherto been obliged to go without that sacrament, and it was not expedient, for the sake of gaining one good thing, to subject themselves to so many disadvantages. God would supply what was wanting through no fault of theirs (p. 437).

These sturdy memorialists carried their point ; they were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the English Vicar, and had given them their own missionary prefect.

Canon Bellesheim has embodied in his narrative—which has the high quality of being clear, straightforward, and methodical—the results of extensive and varied reading, among not only printed works but original sources in these countries and in foreign archives. His biographical sketches of ecclesiastical persons are of great value, as often they must represent considerable research. He is a staunch admirer of Mary of Scots, and defends her with a success which shows how much history has gained by the general opening up of archives and collections in these countries and on the Continent. He claims to be following the most recent German Protestant historians in repudiating the authenticity of the Casket Letters, more emphatically of the longer one from Glasgow. Of Mary's son, James the Sixth, he has a very different opinion :—

[His] reign of twenty years had brought little but calamity and suffering to the Catholics of his native land. Little else, indeed, could have been expected from a monarch in whose character poltroonery and dissimulation were so strangely blended, and whose sole rule of conduct, alike in matters of Church and of State, appeared to be the political expediency of the moment.

And in the appendix to the volume he places a translation from the original Latin of a contemporary estimate (Cod. Barberin. xxxiv. 13, fol. 188) of the King's character, of which this edifying paragraph is the conclusion :—

He [the King] is immoderately given to wine; and not unfrequently, when warmed with some favourite and generous vintage, he is in the habit of exhaling and vomiting forth every sort of vile execration against mankind,

against the Pope, religious Orders and the Catholic Church, and likewise the foulest blasphemies against God and the Saints. Nor does he make an end until he is overpowered by the fumes of wine, and so carried to bed by his immediate attendants.

Dom Hunter Blair's translation of this work is of general elegance, idiomatic and easy reading. He has given very special value to the English edition by his additions and numerous notes. We trust he may be able to speedily complete his valuable work by the fourth, and surely not least interesting volume, which will bring us from the time of the Stuarts to the revival of religion in our own days.

---

1. *The Catholic Directory.* 1890. (Fifty-third annual publication.) London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.
2. *The Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1890.* New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates.
3. *Catholic Home Almanac,* 1890. (Seventh year.) New York, &c.: Benziger Brothers.
4. *The Catholic Annual for 1890.* Edited by JAMES BRITTEN, Hon. Sec. Catholic Truth Society, London: Catholic Truth Society.

THE "Directory" still grows in size; its pages of Catholic information numbered last year 458, this year they mount to 471, whilst the advertisements increase also. There is no need to say anything of the church, or of the usefulness of an annual that most of us remember looking forward to each new year since we were boys. That the plan of it is still unchanged is well; we all know where to look for the thing we want. The two American publications which follow are quite up to their excellence of last year. Among their interesting tales, poems, and other pieces, we have in the "Annual" an account of the new Washington Catholic University, with a good engraving of the Divinity Hall, and in both the Annual and the Almanac accounts with portraits of Father Damian, and portraits and biographical sketches of the late Father Hecker; and both are beautifully printed and abundantly illustrated, whilst the Almanac has a chromo-lithograph of the "Madonna della Sedia." The Catholic Truth Society's Annual comes too late for more than mention. It has an obituary, and list of principal events of 1889 and other useful information, and an abundance of biographical and fictional sketches and numerous illustrations.

---

*Linda's Task; or, The Debt of Honour.* From the French. By Sister MARY FIDELIS. London: Burns & Oates, Limited.

THIS is a simple story of sacrifice and devotion to a father's memory, which is interesting and very gracefully written.

*Lux Mundi : a Series of Studies in the Religion of the Incarnation*  
Edited by CHARLES GORE, M.A. London: John Murray.  
1889.

THE leaders and prophets of the small but respectable sect within the Anglican establishment called "Ritualists," have put forth in this volume a series of essays, twelve in number, on the principal features of Christianity. Thus Canon Scott Holland treats "Faith," Canon Aubrey Moore "The Christian Doctrine of God," the Rev. J. R. Illingworth and the Rev. R. C. Moberly "The Incarnation," the Rev. W. Lock "The Church," the Rev. F. Paget "The Sacraments," &c. The several papers are characterized by considerable learning, much successful apologetic, nervous apprehension of modern thought, and as much Catholic exposition as can be expected from men who think that the voice of the living Church has been dumb since an indefinite epoch between Athanasius and Gregory the Great. These writers consider, or their editor, Mr. Gore, considers, that "theology must take a new development." Heresy and innovation are not development; neither is "the narrowing and hardening of theology by giving it greater definiteness, or multiplying its dogmas" development. The Church must stand "firm in her old truths," but must "assimilate all new material," &c., &c. But what is old, and what is new, what is heresy, and what is development, what is hardening and what is dogma, what is "central" and what is optional—all this, as in the old Jacobite rhyme, is quite another thing. At least this is the way it strikes an outsider. Canon Holland manages to print more than 50 pp. on Faith without once committing himself to a working definition of Christian Faith, either as a habit or an act. He says it is the "simple recognition of the Fatherhood of God—an impulse underlying all faculties, an act of *basal* personality," &c.; not distinguishing it, therefore, from what is natural to man. Much that he says is very true and useful, but rather as an exposition of natural religion than of Faith proper. He talks well to the atheist; but as to the flock, he leads them to the door of the fold and then seems to find it shut. In the essay on "God" Canon Moore professes to show that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity alone is true Monotheism, answering satisfactorily the problems of philosophy as to the nature of the Deity: but he carries this out very imperfectly, failing to show that the Logos must be God, omitting altogether the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and ignoring the rationalistic difficulties as to the plurality of person. The writers who treat of the Incarnation and the Atonement present the usual firm and cogent arguments familiar to Anglicans since Canon Liddon modernized the learned Bull. We miss, however, in the Hon. Arthur Lyttelton's statement, any clear recognition of the nature of that Divine and infinite act which essentially constituted the Sacrifice of Christ. The article on the Church is an eloquent exposition of a state of things which the writer, the sub-warden of Keble, can have had no experience of. Indeed, he

sorrowfully acknowledges that the Church has "many confessions to make of its failure to be true to its ideal" (p. 395). Some of these confessions he puts into words, quoting Dean Church; but there is one "failure" which he unaccountably omits to mention; it is, that the "Anglican" Church to which he belongs, has formally accepted the supremacy of the State in doctrine and discipline, has broken with the Apostolic See, and yet continues to call itself "the Church." Perhaps Mr. Gore's own contribution "On Inspiration" is the most rickety of the edifices here raised by these idealistic architects. The principal of Pusey House is amusingly frank in admitting that he does not know, and knows no one who does know, what Inspiration is. In Genesis, he thinks Inspiration may lie in the "special point of view" taken by the writer; in some books "the animating motive" alone carries Inspiration; with the Psalmist it may be the "intensifying of human faculties;" in the Prophets it is God's movement, but not too much of it—human characteristics have their play, and prophetic anticipations may be erroneous. As for the New Testament, we are told there is no evidence (excluding the Apocalypse) of any claim to Inspiration, except what is involved in authority to teach (pp. 344 *et seq.*) According to Mr. Gore, the Nicene Creed would be equally "inspired" with the four Gospels. But this is contrary to all Catholic tradition. The tone of the writers is not bitter against that Church, which alone has any pretensions to call itself a Church. Canon Moore, however (p. 79), has no business to say that the Catholic Church, even in the beginning of the sixteenth century, had "come to tolerate immorality." Some prelates were immoral; immorality was never officially tolerated.

---

*The Science of Metrology, or Natural Weights and Measures.* By Capt. the Hon. E. NOEL, Rifle Brigade. London: E. Stanford.

THERE are few subjects of closer interest to us all—though many men think little about it—than the ordinary measures we use for calculating the length, the size, the weight, of various familiar objects. Those in use in England have long prescription in their favour, but are in some respects inconvenient. Many scientific men discard them and adopt the French metrical system; and a question has often been raised whether it would not be desirable to adopt this latter for commercial and ordinary purposes, as well as for scientific calculations. This excellent little book is an answer to all such unwise notions. It shows how little reason there is for reducing all weights and measures to the decimal system, as the French and many other continental nations do; but at the same time it admits the defects of the existing English measures, and proposes a new system, based on scientific grounds, and nevertheless likely to be practically useful.

Captain Noel proposes to take the Earth's Polar Semi-diameter, or

semi-axis as he terms it, the length of which is approximately 250,246,000 inches. Then he would take the  $\frac{1}{10,000,000}$  part of this, which measure he would call an ell, the ell being two feet, and each foot twelve inches (as at present) only the new foot would be 12.5123 of our present inches, and each new inch 1.0427 (nearly) of the existing one. Then 10,000 ells, that is the one-thousandth part of the semi-axis of the earth, would be a league, each league to be divided into four miles. For surface measure, he suggests that 100 ells squared should be the new acre, which would only be 72 square feet less than the present one: 625 acres would be a square mile, and 10,000 acres a square league. He further proposes that a cubic foot (new measure) should be a bushel; and a cubic ell, which would of course be 8 cubic feet,—a quarter, which then as now would consist of 8 bushels.

For liquids, the gallon would be one-eighth of a bushel, the cube of six inches, and  $\frac{2}{17}$  less than the existing gallon; the pint (keeping its same proportion as now to the gallon) would be the cube of three inches; the hogshead to be 64 gallons, or a cubic ell.

As to measures of weight; the new pound would be  $\frac{1}{72}$  of the weight of a cubic foot of water, each pound to be 24 ounces, so that an ounce would be one cubic inch of water; 100 pounds to be one hundred-weight, and 20 cwt. one ton. For compound units it is proposed to take as the absolute unit of power such as would raise one ounce one inch in one second. Then one horse-power would be that which would raise 500 pounds one foot in one second,—equal to 144,000 units. Some other suggestions are made on which we need not dwell; but we strongly recommend that all persons interested in the question should peruse with care this little work, which is written with considerable ability by one who has fully studied his subject and thoroughly understands it. It is always difficult to introduce any important changes in such matters; but if any change is to be made, Capt. Noel's suggestions are well worthy of attention.

*Life and Works of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux.* Edited by DOM JOHN MABILLON, Presbyter and Monk of the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur. Translated and edited with additional notes by SAMUEL EALES, M.A., D.C.L. Vol. 1-2. London: John Hodges. 1889.

IT is well-nigh half a century, as we learn from the Preface to these volumes, since it was first proposed to translate and publish an English edition of the works of St. Bernard. The proposal was made by the Rev. Frederick Oakley, then Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, and the Rev. J. S. Brewer, of Queen's

VOL. XXIII.—NO. I. [Third Series.]

P

College, Oxford, and their prospectus, a copy whereof is in the possession of the editor of the work before us, was issued in 1844. The editor, following in the steps of the original projectors, proposes in this translation

To avoid intruding the expression of his personal view of St. Bernard's writings, as they are one after another translated; to put before readers, to the best of his power, the exact equivalent of what his author wrote; and then to leave it to speak for itself.

Now we are glad to bear witness, that the first and third of these promises have been amply redeemed by Mr. Eales. He has wisely chosen Mabillon's edition for his text, and retained the learned Benedictine's invaluable notes, and in all that he has added of his own, we are happy to say we have found nothing out of harmony with the Catholic faith, nor anything in any way objectionable, save a line in the Preface, which reads in the context, as if written in disparagement of St. Teresa and her mysticism. It is with regard to the second of our translator's three promises that we regret to have to complain, that it has not been fulfilled as strictly as we could wish; in a word, we fear Mr. Eales has not everywhere given us the *exact* equivalent of St. Bernard's text, owing to an inclination to condense, and to rid himself of the difficulty of rendering passages which must have seemed not quite distinctly intelligible to him. Our readers shall judge for themselves. Take the first of St. Bernard's letters, the singularly striking and beautiful one written to his nephew Robert, who had been persuaded to leave Citeaux for Cluny. St. Bernard writes, *e.g.* :—

"Primo quidem missus est magnus quidem Prior ab ipso principe Priorum: foris quidem apparens in vestimentis ovium, intrinsecus autem lupus rapax; deceptisque custodibus, estimantibus quidem ovem esse, vœ! vœ! admissus est solus ad solam, lupus ad oviculum. Quid plura! attrabit, allicit, blanditur, et novi Evangelii predicator commendat crapulam," &c.

Now we propose to put a literal version of our own side by side with that of Mr. Eales, italicizing the passages altered, and putting in parentheses those omitted by Mr. Eales. The passage was chosen at haphazard, and a like result was obtained elsewhere, though we are glad to say Mr. Eales's rendering does not appear to be everywhere so loose as in the passages we first selected for trial.

#### OUR TRANSLATION.

First of all indeed, a certain great Prior was sent by *the Prince of priors himself*, showing himself outwardly in sheep's clothing, but within a ravening wolf (and having deceived the shepherds, who thought him a sheep, alas! alas!) he was admitted, (the wolf alone to the lamb by itself. What more!) he entices, wheedles, flatters; preacher as he is of a new gospel, he extols feasting, condemns frugality, &c., &c.

#### MR. EALES'S TRANSLATION.

A certain great Prior was sent forth by *his Superiors*, and he, a wolf disguised in sheep's clothing, was admitted into the sheepfold. He attracts, he allure, he flatters; the preacher of a new gospel, he commends drunkenness, condemns frugality, &c.

We fear Mr. Eales has not caught the meaning of St. Bernard's satirical "Prince of Priors," which he thought it wisest to change into "Superiors." In the Congregation of Cluny, according to its primitive form, the Abbot of Cluny was the sole Abbot; the other monasteries, even though large and flourishing ones, were governed by Priors. It is to the intriguing and unworthy Abbot Pontius that St. Bernard in his great vehemence applies the above epithet. Lower down in the same epistle we have noticed the omission of some lines from the Vulgate. Unfamiliarity with the Vulgate is a sad drawback, though an unavoidable one with Anglicans, for a translator of St. Bernard, as the Saint's text is often interwoven with passages from that version to a degree not met with in any other Father of the Church, while his quotations from the same are to be counted by thousands. As Mr. Eales has so far only given us the letters, being perhaps less than a third of St. Bernard's entire works, we venture to express an earnest hope that in the remaining volumes less freedom of rendering will be used. To our mind, these two volumes might well be re-written in a future edition, otherwise Mr. Eales's translation will be superseded by others. Another and a serious blot is that as frontispiece we have an engraving of St. Bernard in what seems to be a black cowl, instead of a white one, a picture that would do as well for Abbot Pontius himself.

Having said so much by way of criticism, we do not for a moment hesitate to add that this English edition, with all its faults, will be productive of immense good in making people, Protestants above all, know and love the Saint of Clairvaux. Who would think of denying the incalculable good wrought by the works of St. Francis of Sales, though the Saint's original text has been until our own days in many of his works as much, or more, altered than St. Bernard's letters are in Mr. Eales's edition.

At the opening of the second volume is a most interesting note on the Seal of St. Bernard, with facsimile of the same, and accurate descriptive details. Lastly, the volumes are being admirably brought out by Mr. Hodges, and form a noble continuation to Father Gasquet's Henry VIII., and Cornelius a Lapide's commentary on the Gospels, the already published volumes of the Catholic Standard Library. If we have found it our duty to criticize, we should regret it, should such criticism deter any one from the purchase of this truly noble work. Our greatest fears are lest the Life of St. Bernard, with which we presume the edition is to conclude, should be such as to deter Catholics from using Mr. Eales's translation, and we hope he will either confine himself to reproducing the contemporary biographies, or submit his own labour before its publication to Catholic revision. Should it be otherwise, another English translation will be a necessity.

We have left ourselves no room for writing on St. Bernard himself. Our translator rightly says that we have to look at him in more than one capacity, and adds that first of all, and chiefly, he was a monk. It would be difficult for an Anglican to speak of him as a

*Saint*, and this is the rock on which we fear the editor will make shipwreck, though we trust that our anticipations may turn out untrue. Nothing better can we wish Mr. Eales in acknowledgement of his valuable gift than that he may complete his work faithfully. It will be a means of grace to many; may it be even so to himself, by guiding his steps to that Church of Christ, from which St. Bernard drank so deeply of the streams of life-giving doctrine, and of their sweetness, as to earn for himself the title of *Doctor Mellifluus*.

---

*The Great Commentary of CORNELIUS A LAPIDE upon the Holy Gospels.* Translated and edited by the Rev. T. W. MOSSMAN, B.A. (Oxon.), D.D., assisted by various scholars. Parts I.-IV. London: John Hodges.

THE late Mr. Mossman's excellent, though abridged, version of Cornelius a Lapide on the Gospels is being re-issued by Mr. Hodges in parts. We say advisedly "abridged," and on this there should be no mistake. The abridgment is not done by altering and summarizing, as what has appeared of the translation is faithfully literal; but by omitting long quotations, digressions, &c. In this way about a third of the first chapter of the Preface is left out, and about a column of Chapter II., with (rather significantly) a denunciation of Martin Luther & Co. in Chapter III., the Monotessaron, and then a dozen lines or so every now and then in the Commentary. The result is probably advantageous to English readers; but it should be clearly understood. We do not believe the translator knowingly altered anything in a sense contrary to that of the author. At the outset, we stumbled on one of those slips so frequent with Anglican scholars, whose Latinity is apt to get rusty with disuse. A Lapide writes: "Per ea (scil. Evangelia) Scriptura Sacrae Novi Testamenti coronidem impono." Now, as everybody knows, *coronidem impono* means "to conclude," from the *κορωνίς*, or curved line, wherewith copyists used to end a chapter, just as Martial complains of a book that never comes to an end being "*sera coronide longus*." So A Lapide calls the New Testament the *coronis*, or conclusion, of the Bible. But Mr. Mossman has it thus: "Speaking of the Gospels, I would place a crown upon the Scriptures of the New Testament."

---

*A Reply to Dr. Lightfoot's Essays.* By the author of "Supernatural Religion." London: Longmans. 1889.

THIS is a rejoinder to Dr. Lightfoot's answer to the rationalist work, "Supernatural Religion," which attracted so much attention a few years since. The volume, which is chiefly made up of essays reprinted from the *Fortnightly Review*, is entirely one of detail, and, therefore, cannot be analyzed in a notice. The writer appears to me to leave Dr. Lightfoot's main results untouched; and the

very irritation, which is manifest in every page, shows how destructive he feels the attack has been. He succeeds, however, in proving that his opponent has made some slips of detail, which to some extent weaken the force of his argument. To a Catholic, perhaps, the chief interest is, to notice the disadvantage at which an Anglican has to reply to a sceptic. Much of Dr. Lightfoot's ability and learning is neutralised by his being obliged to look in Eusebius and the early Fathers for a conception of Scripture which was evidently unknown to them. We, on the contrary, may fully concede to the sceptic, that the manner in which the canon of the New Testament grew up is entirely inconsistent with its having been considered the sole rule of faith, or dislocated from tradition and the authority of the Church. But we are none the less indebted to Dr. Lightfoot—and even more, in my judgment, to Dr. Sanday—for their masterly defence of the external evidence of the authenticity of the Gospels.

J. R. G.

---

*Part of the Commentary of S. Hippolytus on Daniel.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Translation, by J. R. KENNEDY, B.D. Dublin : Hodges & Co. 1888.

THE fragment which is given us in this scholarly edition is the latter part of Hippolytus' Commentary on Daniel, of which the earlier portions have long been known. It was discovered a few years ago by Dr. Georgiades in the Theological College, in the island of Chalke, and published in a provisional form, while he prepares an edition of the whole treatise. Apart from the interest that must attach to every early Christian document, there is not much of special importance in the one before us. The belief was common at that time, based upon private visions, that the end of the world was at hand. The author, on the contrary, gives it as the result of his interpretation of Daniel and the Apocalypse that the world was to last in all six thousand years, of which five thousand five hundred had passed at the time of our Lord's birth, and, consequently, that it would be destroyed in the year 500. He identifies the *rō karēχov* of 2 Thess. ii. 6 with the fourth beast of Daniel's vision, the Roman empire. He puts this prophecy forward with reluctance, and only to satisfy a curiosity which he condemns, saying, "Tell me if you know it the day of your death, that you occupy yourself with the end of the whole world." There is an interesting saying of our Lord's reported, possibly derived, as Dr. Kennedy suggests, from St. John through St. Irenaeus : "When, therefore, the Lord was telling his disciples about the future kingdom of the saints, how it should be glorious and wonderful, Judas, struck with amazement at the things that were spoken, said, 'And who then shall see these things ?' But the Lord said, 'They shall see them who have become worthy.'

No light is thrown by this fragment on the history of Hippolytus, or on his relations to St. Callistus.

*An Essay on the Theology of the Didache.* By C. TAYLOR, D.D  
Cambridge : Deighton, Bell & Co. 1889.

THE main object of this essay is to show that the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" interpreted the Old Testament in the same allegorical manner as the so-called Epistle of Barnabas and St. Justin. Dr. Taylor very correctly recognizes the close analogy that exists between the Didache and St. Justin, so that there are few dark sayings in the former which are not illustrated by the latter. The most interesting point he notices is the term "Vine of David" applied to the Chalice, which corresponds to the many references in St. Justin to the "blood of grapes," in which it was prophesied that Juda should wash his robe.

---

*The Coming of the Friars and other Historic Essays.* By the Rev.  
AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1889.

DR. JESSOPP is already favourably known to Catholics by his "One generation of a Norfolk House," and to a wider circle of readers by his sketch of East Anglia, entitled "Arcady: For Better or Worse." He has the gift of an easy and graphic style—a gift which has its drawbacks as well as its advantages—and is in sympathy with his subject whatever it may be. He is also desirous to be fair all round; and, although he does not always understand the Catholic position, he never willingly misrepresents it. Not having any theory of his own to advance, nor wishing, apparently, to bolster up the Establishment of which he is a member, he is not under the necessity of twisting facts to suit his own views. That he does not see Catholic matters as a Catholic sees them is the misfortune of his position.

His first essay, "The Coming of the Friars," is a good example of what has been said. We are accustomed nowadays to the Protestant cult of St. Francis of Assisi: and the view of St. Dominic which was popular among non-Catholics of a generation since is no longer maintained. Dr. Jessopp does justice to both, although his sympathies, as might be expected, are with St. Francis rather than St. Dominic. It is only in his conclusions that he goes astray. He paraphrases Macaulay's well-known passages about the methods of the two Churches in dealing with enthusiasm. "Rome has always known how to utilise her enthusiasts. . . . The Church of England has never known how to deal with a man of genius"—and implies that under proper management, Wyclif (who surely had not much to do with the present Anglican Church) and Rowland Williams would have been more appreciated. It is a little odd to learn that want of comprehensiveness is an Anglican failing. "The Minorites were the Low Churchmen of the thirteenth century, the Dominicans the severely orthodox. . . . Rome knew how to yoke the two together." This would imply that St. Francis and his followers denied all sacramental doctrine; but Dr. Jessopp, of course, does

not intend to push his analogy—by no means a true one—so far as this.

Other essays of special interest to Catholics are “Daily Life in a Mediæval Monastery,” which is prefaced by an amusing account of the author’s interview with an itinerant Protestant lecturer, and “The Building Up of a University.” “Village Life Six Hundred Years Ago” was delivered as a lecture in the place described, and, *mutatis mutandis* forms an admirable model for similar local addresses: “The Black Death in East Anglia” and “The Prophet of Walnut-Tree Yard”—a sketch of Lodowick Muggleton, the founder of the Muggletonians—make up a volume which will well repay perusal.

J. B.

---

*Mary Howitt.* An autobiography, edited by her daughter, MARGARET HOWITT. London : Isbister & Co.

*Mary Howitt.* By JAMES BRITTON. London : Catholic Truth Society.

IT may seem strange at first sight thus to place in juxtaposition the two handsome volumes devoted to Mrs. Howitt’s “autobiography,” with the modest penny pamphlet in which the Catholic Truth Society has issued a memoir of the same author. As a matter of fact, however, the latter is, to Catholics, an almost necessary appendix to the former. To them, interesting as is the whole record of a singularly gentle and beautiful life, one event stands out above the rest—the event of her conversion. To the literary world at large, this is a matter of no concern ; and the autobiography, prepared and edited for general perusal, does not dwell upon this nor upon the circumstances which led to it. Mr. Britten’s memoir, on the other hand, written, if we mistake not, shortly after her death, and now re-issued with additions and corrections, is mainly concerned with Mrs. Howitt as a Catholic ; and the incidents of her life, which in God’s good time led her to embrace the One Faith, are those specially selected for comment. Many of these are indeed recorded in the autobiography, but the pamphlet brings them together and adds others, and thus presents this aspect of her life in a connected form.

The “Autobiography” has been so generally reviewed in the daily and weekly press, and the C. T. S.’s “life” is so easily obtainable that we do not propose to give any particulars of Mrs. Howitt’s history, or of the various steps by which she was led from the Society of Friends to the Catholic Church. The path has been trodden by many feet, and the apparently diverse systems of Catholicism and Quakerism would thus seem to have more points of contact than might at first glance be supposed ; but Mary Howitt had wandered far before her steps were led by the “kindly light” into the way of peace. In all her wanderings, however, she never seems to have lost the simplicity and goodness of character, and the sweetness of disposition of which almost every page of these volumes gives evidence.

Long before her eyes were opened to the truth of Catholicism, its practical working appealed to Mrs. Howitt's sympathetic nature, and of this we have many examples in the letters which form so large a portion of these volumes. Thus, in 1870, her visit to the Convent of Ingenbohl, in Switzerland, is the occasion of a charming sketch, in the course of which we find the following reflections:—

What an extraordinary thing is Roman Catholicism! The system is one of the sublimest schemes of priestcraft and spiritual domination that was ever conceived. At the top all is rotten, but at the bottom God, who overrules all things, has caused it to strike its roots into the soil of the common humanity, and send up shoots and crops of an active, a holy, and an indefatigable beneficence such as present Protestantism knows nothing of. Everywhere Catholic women are instructing, collecting orphans from the streets and abodes of death, working for and employing the poor, tending the sick and the contagiously diseased in the palace or the poorest hut, and going about with the simple air and the friendly smile, as if they were only doing the most ordinary work, and felt themselves but unprofitable servants. When Florence Nightingale went forth to nurse the wounded soldiers in the Crimea, she did only a most commonplace deed, for the Catholic women of all ranks had been doing it everywhere for ages. That was not the merit of the thing. The greatness and vital merit of it was, that she introduced the Good Samaritan of Catholicism to the proud Levite of Protestantism, and induced him to go and do likewise.

Her sympathetic mind could penetrate beyond the poor symbols to the things signified. In a previous letter she writes of—

The little wayside tawdry shrine, with its daubs of painting and puppet-show Madonna and child, with their tinsel crowns and country-booth paraphernalia; yet precious to the poor, tender care-worn souls, especially women, with huge loads on their backs, and often still heavier on their hearts: yes, in most abominable taste, but most gracious to the tired, life-weary creatures that kneel there and cross themselves, already too cruelly crossed by the world.

And again—

I did not let anybody see me, but coming out of the chapel I dipped my finger in the holy water, and crossed myself: praying that God would give me the right faiſt—a faith as sincere as governed the poor peasant hearts that have secured His mercies to them.

The prayer was granted at last, but eleven years of doubt had first to be passed.

One more extract may be given—this time not from Mrs. Howitt, but from her husband. Writing from Zürich, he says:

The gates (of the Protestant cemetery) were locked, as were the doors of the church. How odd is this characteristic of Protestantism! Not in England only, but in the very countries and towns on the continent where the inhabitants are of both faiths, the Catholic churches and cemeteries stand open, and the Protestant ones are closed. The Catholics trust the public, but the Protestants cannot, so far as their churches and cemeteries are concerned. . . . There must have been something hard and exclusive in the original leaven of Protestantism. I have noticed that the Fathers of the Reformation, Bullinger, Calvin, Zuringli, &c., as painted by their contemporaries, have faces keen as the east wind, hard as the rock, and most uninviting.

Mr. Britten has had the advantage of Miss Howitt's help in the little penny biography, which is accompanied by an excellent portrait of Mrs. Howitt. It will supply those who have not the opportunity of reading the "Autobiography" with a graphic, though brief, memoir of her life.

---

*The Poor Sisters of Nazareth.* An Illustrated Record of Life at Nazareth House, Hammersmith. Drawn by GEORGE LAMBERT. Written by ALICE MEYNELL. London : Burns, Oates & Co.

THE spirit and genius of the Sisters of Nazareth is well conveyed in Mrs. Meynell's excellently written description. It is difficult to write a book of this kind without introducing foolish praise or over-strained sentiment. But Mrs. Meynell describes the undeniable devotedness of "Nazareth House" without saying a word beyond the truth, and her words are warm and full of feeling, yet restrained and stamped with genuineness and reality. The illustrations of this beautiful and sumptuous book accompany every page and half-page of the narrative. We have the Sisters' chapel, the kitchen, the dispensary, the class-rooms ; we see the Sisters questing, cooking, dressing the "old ladies," "gauffring the caps" (whatever that may mean), lighting the fire, carrying cups and saucers on a tray—they seem, to the uneducated eye, very likely to fall off). We have the whole life of Nazareth House, Hammersmith, displayed before us—with its 100 "old gentlemen," 100 "old ladies," 200 children, and community of 50. Some of the portraits are from the life—like that of the "old gentleman" whose services as acolyte are indicated on page 10. Not a few of the scenes are full of a true poetry, such as "the Angelus" and the "Childrens' Infirmary." The latter, touching as it is, is literally true, even to the actual faces of some of the suffering little ones. The soft outlines of the process by which these spirited designs are reproduced, combines with toned paper, sumptuous print, and wide margins, to make this a truly desirable gift book—one that will please the eye and touch the heart.

---

*Idols; or, The Secret of the Rue Chaussée D'Antin.* Translated from the French of RAOUL DE NAVERY by ANNA T. SADLIER. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son. 1890.

THIS is an acceptable rendering of one of Monsieur de Navery's popular works. It is an exciting story of a crime whose secret is known only in the confessional. It will be enough to say that when the story is told justice has cleared the innocent and punished the guilty.

---

1. *Missæ pro Defunctis. Editio 1<sup>a</sup> post typicam. 2. Missale ad usum sacerdotum cœcuentium concinnatum. Editio 2<sup>a</sup>. 3. Officia propria Mysteriorum et Instrumentorum Passionis D. N. J. C. Cum approbatione S. R. Cong. 4. Hore Diurnæ Brev. Rom. Editio 1<sup>a</sup> post typicam. 5. Diurnale parvum sive epitome ex horis diurnis continens psalmos quotidie recitandos et Commune Sanctorum, una cum Officio B. M. V. 6. Rituale Parvum continens Sacramentorum administrationem, &c., ex Rituale Romano. 7. Manuale Clericorum ad usum eorum præcipue qui in Seminaris Clericorum versantur collegit, dispositus, edidit P. JOSEPHUS SCHNEIDER, S.J. Editio 3<sup>a</sup>. All the above. Ratisbona : F. Pustet. 1889-90.*

THE new editions of liturgical books which come first in the above list are in the now well-known admirable style of the Pustet press; good opaque paper, bold type, artistic vignettes and initial letters. Beyond this we need say little in explanation of individual volumes. The Diurnal (4) is for so small-sized book (it is a 32mo), printed in very clear type; it contains all the offices up to date, and has also added to the usual prayers after Mass, the Litanies of Jesus and of Loreto, prayers before and after Confession, &c., and finally it is very cheap (2s. 6d. in paper). The Diurnale Parvum (5), an ingenious novelty, is a thin, light volume of nearly 150 pages, containing in large distinct type the psalms of Lauds and of the day Hours, the antiphons and hymns from the Common of the Saints, and the prayers for the Saints' days through the year; so that, on most days, the small hours can be recited from a volume considerably smaller and more easily carried about than the usual Diurnal. The Manuale Clericorum (7) is about the size of the same Father Schneider's well-known Manuale Sacerdotum, and of similar character, but designed for the seminarist. Besides a large collection of appropriate prayers and meditations there are instructions in the various Orders, their obligations, &c., on the recitation of the Breviary, and excellent rubrical instructions for the Ministers at Pontifical and other functions through the year.

Urkunden sur Geschichte der Mittelalterlichen Universitäten :  
*Registrum Procuratorum Nationis Anglicanæ in Universitate Parisiensi. 1333-1348.* Edidit HENRICUS DENIFLÉ, O.P.  
 Freiburg : Herder. 1889.

FATHER DENIFLE is everywhere known for his history of the mediaeval universities. He now publishes the first instalment of the Registers of the old University of Paris, as far as they refer to the "Natio Anglicana,"—which, be it noted, is not merely our England. The Registers clearly comprehend, under the title "Natio Anglicana," Great Britain, Ireland, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, Denmark, and Scandinavia. The present volume, though extending only over the years 1333 and 1338-48,

contains, it need hardly be said, many interesting documents now first published, and which throw light on the history of culture, science, and religion. What a difficult task Father Deniffé has set himself, when he undertakes to overcome the tremendous difficulties in deciphering these ancient documents, and how successfully he does it the reader may see from the "Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis" (Paris : Delalain. 1889) which he published a few months ago. The study of the volume before us brings home the undeniable fact that Scotland and Scotch scholars were in the ascendancy over England and the English, during the period treated, at Paris. Among the "procurators" we meet "Johannes de Waltirstona Scotus," who more than once filled this office. The University swarmed with Scotch masters; "Magistri fuerunt presentes: Joannes Scotus, antiquior in natione, Hugo Scotus, Philippus Scotus, Joannes Scotus de Rathey" (p. 75). In 1340 was proctor of the Natio Anglicana, "Johannes de Kynhard Scotus," the professor under whose guidance "Normannus de Lesby Scotus" was proclaimed licentiate (p. 97). Next year "Magister Robert Fyf Scotus" became proctor; he was succeeded by "Willelmus de Grinlaw Scotus." But the name which most frequently appears in the list of proctors is "Walterus de Wardlaw Scotus," doubtless the afterwards Bishop of Glasgow and Cardinal. English and Scotch students will be specially grateful to Father Deniffé for this instalment of a work which will be of no small interest to them and of value towards ecclesiastical history.

A. BELLESHEIM.

---

*Le Mouvement Littéraire au XIXme Siècle.* Par GEORGES PELISSIER.  
Paris : Hachette.

THERE is so much that is really good in this book in the way of literary criticism that we are sorry to find in it at the same time certain elements which make it impossible to recommend it to Catholic readers as a guide. It is a survey of the various phases of French literature from the days of the first Empire to our own. It is evidently the work of a thoughtful student of men and things, as well as of books. Unfortunately, M. Pelissier looks only at literature from the artist's point of view, and does not attach to the moral value of a work that importance which belongs to it in really sound criticism, so we find in his pages enthusiastic praise of more than one work which no publisher with the fear of Lord Campbell's Act before his eyes dare reproduce here in England. This is all the more to be regretted, because, happily, the French literature of the century is quite rich enough even if these works of misguided genius were relegated to that peculiar world in which they chiefly circulate.

---

*Five Months' Fine Weather in Canada, Western U.S., and Mexico.*  
By Mrs. E. H. CARBUTT. London : Sampson Low, Marston,  
Searle, and Rivington. 1889.

**A**JOURNEY covering so much ground in so short a time was somewhat of a scramble, and it has been chronicled with a running pen with occasional lapses into slovenly style ; on the other hand, there are no painful attempts at " fine writing," and the impressions resulting from Mrs. Carbutt's appreciative observation are given with evident fairness and sincerity.

The ubiquity of the American baby is as well known as the pre-cocity of the American child. Mrs. Carbutt remarks :

There are always babies in ordinary or Pulman cars. Children do not have a good time in America. When a few weeks old their travels begin. They swarm in hotels, little dots of two or three years old taking meals at the table-d'hôte at seven and eight o'clock in the evening, and those of riper years, such as six, roam all over the hotels alone, playing with the elevator-boys and the waiters. They look very delicate. On this occasion there were several babies in the car, and they all screamed.

Of Chicago Mrs. Carbutt writes :

Protection does not always keep the wolf from the door. I was astonished to find from a local paper that there is great poverty even in this prosperous city. It is a pitiful tale, quite equal to "The Bitter Cry of Outcast London." Here the misery of low wages is increased by the excessive cost of living.

Of domestic servants, she says :

We noticed everywhere that, though wages are high in the States, the work is very hard, and servants are not looked upon as members of the household, but as machines. A servant undertakes to do certain work, and if she is ill, she is just turned out to make room for a machine in better working order. Of course, the servants show just as little regard for their employers.

Mrs. Carbutt displays more sympathy for the poor Chinese than many travellers do ; and quotes many kindly things of John Chinaman—" Johnny has this great superiority that he requires no watching. He will work all the time as if his master's eye were on him." Taken altogether the book is an intelligent account of a highly interesting trip.

---

*Ballads of the Brave, Poems of Chivalry, Enterprise, Courage, and Constancy, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* Selected and Arranged by FREDERICK LANGBRIDGE, M.A. With Notes. London : Methuen & Co. 1890.

**A**SELECTION of more than two hundred pieces, filling 135 pages, should satisfy the most exacting. The book is nicely got up, and would make an excellent school prize.

---

*The Persecutions of Annam: A History of Christianity in Cochin China and Tonking.* By JOHN R. SHORTLAND, M.A., Canon of Plymouth. London: Burns & Oates. 1889.

THIS is an acceptable reprint of the late Canon Shortland's well-known work, forming a volume of the Granville Popular Library.

---

*The Story of the Nations. Early Britain,* by ALFRED J. CHURCH, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1889.

PROFESSOR CHURCH'S work on Early Britain is fully up to the high standard of the excellent series to which it belongs. It is largely based on the writings of Mr. Freeman and of the late Mr. J. R. Green, but it does not follow the latter in his curious fashion of making the history of our country begin with the landing of the Saxons. Professor Church traces with a practised hand in bold outline what was done by Briton and Roman, Saxon and Dane, in the first ten centuries of our island story. His book has a wider range than his title would indicate to most readers, and he refers to this in his preface, where he says :

I do not know whether it is necessary to vindicate the propriety of my title. This island may have ceased to be properly called "Britain" after the middle of the fifth century; but it certainly could not be called "England" before that time. To the writers and readers of Latin it was always "Britannia," and it is still formally known as "Britain" to the rest of the world.

The illustrations are very well chosen, but, as in nearly all the volume of this series, some of them are either very poorly executed or badly printed. It is a pity this weak point cannot be remedied.

---

*Juifs et Opportunistes. Le Judaïsme et Egypte et en Syrie.* Par GEORGES CORNEILHAN. Paris: Sauvaitre. 1889.

M. CORNEILHAN'S work belongs to the class of French anti-Semitic literature which M. Drumont's campaign against the Jews has called into existence. For an English reader the most interesting passages are those which deal with the exploitation of Egypt by the big financial houses; but even here the author's bold assertions would make more impression on the reader if they were supported by a little more documentary evidence. M. Corneilhan does not particularly like English people; he cannot resist the temptation to have an occasional hit at them, and it must be added that he falls into palpable errors about English affairs which make one ask if his impressions of the Jews are more accurate than his ideas about ourselves.

---

*The Strange Adventures of Little Snowdrop : and other Tales.* By CLARA MULHOLLAND. London : R. Washbourne, 1889.

WE like the "other" and shorter tales, three in number, quite as well as "Little Snowdrop," whose adventures—pleasantly told—will naturally greatly please those little nursery-folk, for whose delectation the book is written. "The Tale of a Green Coat" is a quaint story—a strong moral powder in good fictional jam—which will, or at least ought to, do disobedient little sinners good.

---

*The Castle and the Manor ; or, My Hero and His Friends.* A Story. By M. A. DE WINTER, of Rome. London : Burns & Oates.

IS chiefly concerned with the doings of the children of two families living respectively at the Castle and the Manor. It may interest in the nursery or junior class-room ; but it was surely unnecessary to reprint recitations from Tennyson, and a whole scene from Shakespeare's "King John" !

---

*Le Divorce de Napoléon.* Par HENRI WELSCHINGER. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1889.

M. WELSCHINGER has already distinguished himself by a powerful exposure of Napoleon's perfidy in the case of the Duc d'Enghien. He now selects another instance of the baseness of the great Emperor, and treats it with equal ability. Many documents which were refused by Napoleon III. to M. d'Haussonville, when writing *L'Eglise romaine et le premier Empire*, are now accessible to the public. M. Welschinger gives a digest of these, and in some cases the originals in full. He proves that the marriage of 1804 was celebrated by Cardinal Fesch without any witnesses whatever. The Cardinal had, however, previously obtained from the Pope all the dispensations required for the fulfilment of his duties as Grand Almoner. M. Welschinger holds that among these was included the permission to celebrate marriage without the presence of the parish priest and witnesses, and that consequently the marriage with Josephine was valid. It is not easy to reconcile this opinion with Pius VII.'s approval of the marriage with Marie Louise (see "Le Pape Pie VII. à Savone," par H. Chotard). Whatever the Holy Father may have granted, it is clear from the documents cited by M. Welschinger that Napoleon himself did not look upon the marriage of 1804 as a binding contract. He submitted to go through the ceremony merely to satisfy Josephine, and therefore he insisted on absolute secrecy. An alliance with one of the royal families of Europe was already contemplated by him.

T. B. S.

---

*Histoire de la Civilisation contemporaine en France.* Par ALFRED RAMBAUD, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. Paris : A. Colin et Cie. 1888.

THIS work is really the third and concluding volume of M. Rambaud's "Histoire de la Civilisation Française." The two former volumes went as far as the opening of the Revolution; the present volume deals with the century that has since elapsed. The title adopted by the author will not perhaps convey to English readers an exact notion of the character of his labours. His aim is to write the history, not of courts and camps, but of the people; to give an account of the political, economical, and religious changes; to trace the progress of literature and education, art and science; to describe the habits, the dress, and the amusements of his countrymen. He does not narrate or moralize, yet his book is not a mere catalogue of facts. The charm of his style and the importance of his matter attract the reader's attention throughout: there is not a single dull page in the volume. It may, however, be well to warn some readers that M. Rambaud is an ardent, though not a fanatical, admirer of democracy. Where so much is excellent it is difficult to commend any particular passage. Chapter vii., treating of the history of the Church during the Revolution and the First Empire, may perhaps be singled out as typical of his method and opinions. A few passages from other chapters are here subjoined, but the reader must bear in mind that the clear and terse original loses much in translation.

Royalty did three things for France: it created the unity and greatness of the State; it broke down the power of the ruling classes, but left them their privileges; it destroyed public liberty and established a despotism. The Revolution maintained the first, completed the second, and swept away the third. Its work may be summed up in three words: Unity, Equality, Freedom (pp. 3-4).

In dealing with the noble and the peasant, the Constituent Assembly took the part of the noble; the Legislative Assembly tried to treat both alike; the Convention sided with the peasant. The Constituent Assembly freed the peasant from the more oppressive dues; the Legislative Assembly freed him from such as were unjust; the Convention freed him from all. Under the Constituent Assembly the peasant was still the tenant of his old masters; the Legislative Assembly made him independent of them; the Convention enriched him at their expense. Thus, while in England, in Germany, and in Russia the peasant has had to pay a great sum for his rights, the French peasant has had them given to him for nothing. What kings and nobles in their day of power used to sell him bit by bit and at a high price, the Revolution has bestowed on him in the mass and as a free gift. . . . The rural democracy rose up in a moment from its degradation of centuries; it played the most important part that ever fell to a people's lot; peasant deputies sat in our Assemblies, and peasant soldiers under peasant generals conquered Europe (pp. 276-278).

M. Rambaud's account of the "Realistic" school of novelists will be read with interest:—

The study of the "real" had already been carried tolerably far by Balzac and Georges Sand. The new school, however, reproached them

with restricting their attention to man as a moral being, whereas he ought to be treated as a *physical* being. Love and hatred, jealousy and anger were to be explained by the action of objects on his organism, his nerves, and his senses. His sensations must be analysed as well as his sentiments, his appetites as well as his aspirations, his diseases as well as his passions. He should be dealt with not only psychologically but physiologically, and even pathologically. The novelist must not be contented with plunging into the cellars and sewers of society ; he must frequent the laboratory, the hospital-ward, and the dissecting-room. It was the contest between the rival philosophies transferred to literature. The novel had been spiritualistic : it was to become materialistic. It had considered man as a free agent : it was now to exaggerate the influence of physical fatalism, of hereditary fatalism, of the fatalism of environment. Man's part became less and less ; the part played by things grew more and more. Given a man's physical complexion, the temperament transmitted to him by his parents, the condition of the atmosphere, the temperature indicated by the thermometer, his conduct under various circumstances could then be determined beforehand. Art devoted all the resources of the most glowing language to describe colours, sounds, and scents. Above all, it was necessary to stop at nothing ; in the new art, the indecent and the immoral had no meaning (p. 600).

T. B. SCANNELL.

---

*La Jeunesse du Roi Charles-Albert.* Par le Marquis COSTA DE BEAUREGARD. Paris : E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie. 1889.

AFTER his defeat at Novara, Charles Albert said : "My life has been a romance, but I have not been known." For good or for evil, it is to him that United Italy owes most. Cavour and his tool, Napoleon III., succeeded where he failed ; but it was his heroic struggle with Austria which singled out the little kingdom of Sardinia for the leadership among the Italian States. The early years of such a man well deserves attention. M. Costa de Beauregard has given us a brilliant and sympathetic sketch of his hero. We reserve a detailed account of it till after the appearance of the second part, "L'Epilogue d'un règne, Novara et Oporto," which is promised shortly.

A word of praise is due to the publishers for the admirable form in which they have produced M. Costa de Beauregard's labours, and also for the portraits of the youthful prince.

T. B. S.

---

*Le Duc d'Enghien, 1772-1804.* Par HENRI WELSCHINGER. Paris : E. Plon Nourrit & Cie. 1888.

THE tragic story of the Duc d'Enghien's brief life and his judicial murder by the first Napoleon is told in very full detail by M. Henri Welschinger. Much of the material which he has employed in its composition is new, as he has made use of hitherto unpublished family papers and documents in the French national archives. Every new work bearing on the First Empire seems to be fated to darken the picture of the first Napoleon's character, and M. Welschinger's book on the unfortunate Duc d'Enghien is no exception

to the rule. Many of the facts connected with the capture and execution of the Duke are put in a new light, and Napoleon's guilt as the chief actor in the crime comes out, if possible, clearer than ever. No student of the history of the First Empire can afford to neglect M. Welschinger's work.

---

*Non-Biblical Systems of Religion. A Symposium.* By the Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., Rev. Canon RAWLINSON, M.A., Rev. W. WRIGHT, D.D., Rabbi G. J. EMANUEL, B.A., Sir WILLIAM MUIR, Rev. EDWIN JOHNSON, M.A., T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D., Ph.D., the Hon. RASMUS B. ANDERSON, Rev. WM. NICOLSON, M.A. London: James Nisbet & Co.

THIS book is made up of thirteen essays by nine different authors. The essays are articles reprinted from the *Homiletic Magazine*, and of varying interest and merit. We confess the title of the volume puzzles us. Before we had read the essays we imagined that their subjects would be religions not founded on the Bible, but we find one essay on Judaism and two on Christianity. The puzzle is increased by the fact that at the head of the first page the title appears in another form, thus:—"Non-Christian Religions. A Symposium on: What is the Relation of Non-Christian Systems to Biblical Theology?" On the whole, it seems as if the editors were not quite clear about the purpose of their book—perhaps because they are not quite clear as to what is Biblical theology.

Hence we have a certain vagueness of motive and treatment—a vagueness which is especially conspicuous in Archdeacon Farrar's introductory essay on "Ethnic Inspiration." The writer has no very definite idea of what he means by inspiration, so that his essay is a very inconclusive performance. On the other hand, where the essays sum up facts, and abstain from vague theorizing, they are both interesting and valuable. Canon Rawlinson's account of the growth of Egyptian polytheism, and of the older monotheism which underlay it, sets forth in popular style one of the most important results of the science of religions. His comparison of Egyptian and Christian morality forms the second part of what is altogether a most useful essay on the religion of ancient Egypt. Dr. Wright, best known by his works on the Hittites, deals in the same clear, scholarly fashion with the Canaanite religions. Mr. Johnson's essay on the earlier Hellenic Religions is rather thin, but contains some good points; while the essay on Judaism derives its chief interest from the fact that it is from the pen of a Jewish Rabbi. Sir William Muir, a recognized master of his subject, compares Islam and Christianity. Dr. Rhys Davids, in his essay on Buddhism, has some well-considered remarks on the often exaggerated resemblance between Buddhist and Christian doctrines. Thus he says:—

A critical examination of any one of these resemblances would show that in no single instance are the ideas identical. They are at most

VOL. XXIII.—NO. I. [Third Series.]

Q

analogous. The words are never used in precisely the same sense. They are wrapped up with implications, connotations, which are always more or less present to the mind of the Buddhists who use them. The ideas themselves, therefore, expressed in the words are not the same, and we have to deal, not with any real agreement, but only with points of contact.

And again, after referring to points in the Buddhist scriptures which recall familiar passages in the Bible, Dr. Rhys Davids says :—

One might go on quoting such passages indefinitely or point out phrases in the Buddhist writings which could be transferred to Christian sermons. But in no case does the analogy really run on all fours, nor could any serious argument be founded on the apparent identity of expression, or the suggested similarity of thought. For—and here we come to the gist of the matter—it is precisely those ideas in the Bible which are most instinctively and specially Christian, which are not only wanting in, but are absolutely contradicted in Buddhism.

The essays on the ancient Scandinavian Religion by the Hon. Rasmus B. Anderson break new ground. In Positivism Professor Thomson has a more threadbare subject. The concluding essays by the Rev. W. Nicolson, on the "One Purely Moral Religion," are, like the introduction, rather vague. The book gains in some points from being the work of several authors, but it loses any real unity of argument and purpose from this cause.

---

*The Baglioni: a Tragedy.* By FAIRFAX L. CARTWRIGHT, B.A., Second Secretary at Her Majesty's Legation, Teheran. London : Field & Tuer.

THE plot of this tragedy is based upon the feuds of the Baglioni family at Perugia, at the close of the fifteenth century. Here we have murders and "many more," and though there are some vigorous lines, dramatic force, from a stage point of view, is lacking. Filippo da Braccio, the villain of the piece, is too heavily weighted with memories of Iago and "Richard the Third."

---

*Chased by Wolves, and other Instructive Stories.* Chiefly Translated from the French, German, and Italian. By H. J. GILL, M.A., T.C.D. Dublin : M. H. Gill & Son.

A NEAT volume of short but well-told tales which young people are sure to appreciate.

## Record of Roman Documents.

---

**ALTAR.**—*Vid.* “Consecration” and “Reconsecration.”

**BEATIFICATION.**—Approval of the miracles, as a necessary preliminary in the process of Beatification of Venerable Pompilio Pirotti, priest of the Order of Pious Schools. *Vid. Tablet*, Sept. 28, 1889.

Solemn Beatification of the Venerable John Gabriel Perboyre, priest of the Congregation of the Missions of S. Vincent de Paul, put to death for the faith in China, September, 1840. *Vid. Catholic Times*, Nov. 15, 1889.

Solemn Beatification of the Venerable Peter John Louis Chanel, a Marist Father, the Proto-Martyr of Oceania. *Vid. Catholic Times*, Nov. 22, 1889.

**BENEDICTION.**—*Vid.* “Vernacular.”

**CONSECRATION OF SEVERAL ALTARS AT ONE CEREMONY.**—For an Instruction issued in Feb., 1888, by the S. R. C. as to the method of conducting this ceremony—*Vid. Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Oct., 1889.

**DIVINE OFFICE.**—In the Responsories, which come after the Lessons at Matins, it sometimes happens that two asterisks are found, and a doubt arises as to whether the first repetition of the Responsory is to be continued as far as the verse, or is to stop at the second asterisk. The S. Congregation decrees that the first repetition goes only as far as the second asterisk. (*S. R. C.*, 1878.) *Vid. Tablet*, Dec. 21, 1889.

**FUNERAL LITURGICAL COLOURS.**—At Funerals and at Masses for the Dead the antependium and tabernacle veil at the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, even though it be the High Altar or the only Altar, should be purple, not black. (*S. R. C.*, Dec. 1, 1882.) *Vid. Tablet*, Oct. 26, 1889.

**S. JOSEPH.**—A special prayer in honour of S. Joseph to be added to the Rosary during the month of October—to be observed in perpetuum (*S. Cong. Reliq. et Indulg.*, Sept. 21, 1889). *Vid. Tablet*, Oct. 5, 1889.

The following is an English translation of the prayer referred to above:—

**PRAYER TO S. JOSEPH.**—To thee, O blessed Joseph, we fly in our tribulation; and having implored the help of thy most holy Spouse, we now confidently demand thy patronage also. By that love which united Thee with the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, and by the fatherly affection with which thou didst embrace the Child Jesus, we humbly beg of thee to look down with compassion on the inheritance which Jesus Christ has acquired with His precious blood, and succour our necessities by thy power and thy influence. Do thou, O most prudent Guardian of the Holy

Family, watch over the chosen posterity of Jesus Christ; ward off from us, O most loving Father, all infection of error and corruption; aid us graciously from heaven, O most powerful protector, in this contest with the Powers of Darkness; and as thou didst of old deliver the Child Jesus from imminent danger of death, so now also do thou defend God's Holy Church from the snares of her enemies and from all adversity. Protect each of us perpetually by thy patronage, that, following thy example and strengthened by thy aid, we may live a saintly life, die a holy death, and attain to eternal happiness in heaven.—*Amen.*

**NON-CATHOLIC RELIGIOUS FUNCTIONS.**—The Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition being questioned as to the lawfulness of Catholics being present at Non-Catholic Religious Functions, with especial reference to Polish children who, on Festal days, are compelled to attend service in the Orthodox Church, declares it to be unlawful. (*Cong. S. Inq.*, June 28, 1889). *Vid. Tablet*, Oct. 19, 1889.

**OFFICE.**—*Vid. "Votive" and "Divine."*

**RECONSECRATION OF ALTARS.**—If the stone covering the sepulchre of an altar be loose, but has not been moved, the Bishop may refix it by means of fresh cement; he cannot sub-delegate this power unless he has Apostolic faculties so to do. If doubt remain as to the stone being moved the altar is to be reconsecrated; the shorter form may, however, be used with permission of the Apostolic See. (*S. R. C.*, May 18, 1883.) *Vid. Tablet*, Dec. 7, 1889.

**RENEWAL OF VOWS.**—The Sacred Congregation of Rites condemns the practice adopted in some convents of each nun renewing her vows individually before the priest holding in his hands the Blessed Sacrament which she then receives. This renewal would be made more properly outside Mass, but if during Mass the Formula of renewal should be recited by one of the sisters, only the rest repeating it mentally. Of the other method it says: *Modus in casu prorsus eliminandus.* (*S. R. C.*, Jan. 10, 1870.) *Vid. Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Dec., 1889.

**SACRED HEART.**—For the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites raising the Feast of the Sacred Heart to a double of the First Class, (*S. R. C.*, June 28, 1889). *Vid. Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Nov., 1889.

**VERNACULAR AT BENEDICTION.**—It is permitted to use prayers in the Vernacular at Benediction, but not immediately before the Blessing. (*S. R. C.*, March 23, 1881.)

**VOTIVE OFFICES.**—On Tuesdays the Votive Office assigned is that of the Holy Apostles, but at Rome the office of SS. Peter and Paul. This latter regulation affects equally those who dwell in Rome, and those who, living out of Rome, follow the Roman Calendar. (*S. R. C.*, May 18, 1889.) *Vid. Tablet*, Nov. 9, 1889.

**Vows.**—*Vid. "Renewal."*

